arXiv:1111.1332v1 [math.AP] 5 Nov 2011

On a fractional Nirenberg problem, part I: blow up analysis and compactness of solutions

Tianling Jin[*], YanYan Li[†], Jingang Xiong[‡]

November 8, 2011

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Preliminaries **7**
- 2.1 A weighted Sobolev space . . . 7
- 2.2 Weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations . . . 9
- 2.3 Local Schauder estimates . . . 14

3 Proof of Theorem 1.5 **20**

4 Local analysis near isolated blow up points **24**

5 Estimates on the sphere and proofs of main theorems **41**

A Appendix **49**
- A.1 A Kazdan-Warner identity . . . 49
- A.2 A proof of Lemma 4.4 . . . 50
- A.3 Two lemmas on maximum principles . . . 51
- A.4 Complementarities . . . 54

1 Introduction

The Nirenberg problem concerns the following: For which positive function K on the standard sphere $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_{\mathbb{S}^n}), n \geq 2$, there exists a function w on $\mathbb{S}^n$ such that the scalar curvature (Gauss

---

[*] Supported in part by a University and Louis Bevier Dissertation Fellowship at Rutgers University and by Rutgers University School of Art and Science Excellence Fellowship.

[†] Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0701545 and DMS-1065971 and by Program for Changjiang Scholars and Innovative Research Team in University in China.

[‡] Supported in part by CSC project for visiting Rutgers University and NSFC No. 11071020.

curvature in dimension $n = 2$) R_g of the conformal metric $g = e^w g_{\mathbb{S}^n}$ is equal to K on $\mathbb{S}^n$? The problem is equivalent to solving

$$-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} w + 1 = Ke^{2w}, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^2,$$

and

$$-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} v + c(n)R_0 v = c(n)Kv^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n \text{ for } n \geq 3,$$

where $c(n) = (n-2)/(4(n-1))$, $R_0 = n(n-1)$ is the scalar curvature of $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_{\mathbb{S}^n})$ and $v = e^{\frac{n-2}{4}w}$.

The first work on the problem is by D. Koutroufiotis [65], where the solvability on $\mathbb{S}^2$ is established when K is assumed to be an antipodally symmetric function which is close to 1. Moser [78] established the solvability on $\mathbb{S}^2$ for all antipodally symmetric functions K which is positive somewhere. Without assuming any symmetry assumption on K, sufficient conditions were given in dimension $n = 2$ by Chang and Yang [30] and [31], and in dimension $n = 3$ by Bahri and Coron [6]. Compactness of all solutions in dimensions $n = 2, 3$ can be found in work of Chang, Gursky and Yang [29], Han [55] and Schoen and Zhang [88]. In these dimensions, a sequence of solutions can not blow up at more than one point. Compactness and existence of solutions in higher dimensions were studied by Li in [68] and [69]. The situation is very different, as far as the compactness issues are concerned: In dimension $n \geq 4$, a sequence of solutions can blow up at more than one point, as shown in [69]. There have been many papers on the problem and related ones, see, e.g., [1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 27, 34, 35, 33, 37, 44, 47, 55, 56, 58, 61, 62, 67, 75, 77, 83, 84, 93, 95, 96].

In [54], Graham, Jenne, Mason and Sparling constructed a sequence of conformally covariant elliptic operators, $\{P_k^g\}$, on Riemannian manifolds for all positive integers k if n is odd, and for $k \in \{1, \cdots, n/2\}$ if n is even. Moreover, P_1^g is the conformal Laplacian $-L_g := -\Delta_g + c(n)R_g$ and P_2^g is the Paneitz operator. The construction in [54] is based on the ambient metric construction of [49]. Up to positive constants $P_1^g(1)$ is the scalar curvature of g and $P_2^g(1)$ is the Q-curvature. Prescribing Q-curvature problem on $\mathbb{S}^n$ was studied extensively, see, e.g., [8, 41, 42, 43, 50, 91, 92].

Making use of a generalized Dirichlet to Neumann map, Graham and Zworski [53] introduced a meromorphic family of conformally invariant operators on the conformal infinity of asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds. Recently, Chang and González [28] reconciled the way of Graham and Zworski to define conformally invariant operators P_σ^g of non-integer order $\sigma \in (0, \frac{n}{2})$ and the localization method of Caffarelli and Silvestre [22] for factional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ on the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$. These lead naturally to a fractional order curvature $R_\sigma^g := P_\sigma^g(1)$, which will be called σ-curvature in this paper. A typical example is that standard conformal spheres $(\mathbb{S}^n, [g_{\mathbb{S}^n}])$ are the conformal infinity of Poincaré disks $(\mathbb{B}^{n+1}, g_{\mathbb{B}^{n+1}})$. In this case, σ-curvature can be expressed in the following explicit way. Let g be a representative in the conformal class $[g_{\mathbb{S}^n}]$ and write $g = v^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} g_{\mathbb{S}^n}$, where v is positive and smooth on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Then the σ-curvature for $(\mathbb{S}^n, g)$ can be computed as

$$R_g^\sigma = v^{-\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} P_\sigma(v), \tag{1.1}$$

where P_σ is an *intertwining operator* and

$$P_\sigma = \frac{\Gamma(B + \frac{1}{2} + \sigma)}{\Gamma(B + \frac{1}{2} - \sigma)}, \quad B = \sqrt{-\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} + \left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)^2}, \tag{1.2}$$

Γ is the Gamma function and $\Delta_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_{\mathbb{S}^n})$. The operator P_σ can be seen more concretely on $\mathbb{R}^n$ using stereographic projection. The stereographic projection from $\mathbb{S}^n\backslash\{N\}$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the inverse of

$$F:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{S}^n\setminus\{N\},\quad x\mapsto\left(\frac{2x}{1+|x|^2},\frac{|x|^2-1}{|x|^2+1}\right),$$

where N is the north pole of $\mathbb{S}^n$. Then

$$(P_\sigma(\phi))\circ F=|J_F|^{-\frac{n+2\sigma}{2n}}(-\Delta)^\sigma(|J_F|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}}(\phi\circ F)),\quad\text{for }\phi\in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)\tag{1.3}$$

where

$$|J_F|=\left(\frac{2}{1+|x|^2}\right)^n,$$

and $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ is the fractional Laplacian operator (see, e.g., page 117 of [86]). When $\sigma\in(0,1)$, Pavlov and Samko [81] showed that

$$P_\sigma(v)(\xi)=P_\sigma(1)v(\xi)+c_{n,-\sigma}\int_{\mathbb{S}^n}\frac{v(\xi)-v(\zeta)}{|\xi-\zeta|^{n+2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}vol_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}(\zeta)\tag{1.4}$$

for $v\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$, where $c_{n,-\sigma}=\frac{2^{2\sigma}\sigma\Gamma(\frac{n+2\sigma}{2})}{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}\Gamma(1-\sigma)}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{S}^n}$ is understood as $\lim\limits_{\varepsilon\to0}\int_{|x-y|>\varepsilon}$.

For the σ-curvatures on general manifolds we refer to [53], [28], [52] and references therein. Corresponding to the Yamabe problem, fractional Yamabe problems for σ-curvatures are studied in [51], [52] and [82], and fractional Yamabe flows on $\mathbb{S}^n$ are studied in [64].

From (1.1), we consider

$$P_\sigma(v)=c(n,\sigma)Kv^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}},\quad\text{on }\mathbb{S}^n,\tag{1.5}$$

where $c(n,\sigma)=P_\sigma(1)$, and $K>0$ is a continuous function on $\mathbb{S}^n$. When $K=1$, (1.5) is the Euler-Lagrange equation for a functional associated to the fractional Sobolev inequality on $\mathbb{S}^n$ (see [8]), and all positive solutions must be of the form

$$v_{\xi_0,\lambda}(\xi)=\left(\frac{2\lambda}{2+(\lambda^2-1)(1-\cos dist_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}(\xi,\xi_0))}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}},\quad\xi\in\mathbb{S}^n\tag{1.6}$$

for some $\xi_0\in\mathbb{S}^n$ and positive constant λ. This classification can be found in [74], [36] and [70]. In general, (1.5) may have no positive solution, since if v is a positive solution of (1.5) with $K\in C^1(\mathbb{S}^n)$ then it has to satisfy the Kazdan-Warner type condition

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n}\langle\nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}K,\nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}\xi\rangle v^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}\xi=0.\tag{1.7}$$

Consequently if $K(\xi)=\xi_{n+1}+2$, (1.5) has no solutions. The proof of (1.7) is provided in Appendix A.1.

In this and a subsequent paper [63], we study (1.5) with $\sigma\in(0,1)$, a fractional Nirenberg problem. Throughout the paper, we assume that $\sigma\in(0,1)$ without otherwise stated.

Definition 1.1. *For $d>0$, we say that $K\in C(\mathbb{S}^n)$ has flatness order greater than d at ξ if, in some local coordinate system $\{y_1,\cdots,y_n\}$ centered at ξ, there exists a neighborhood $\mathscr{O}$ of 0 such that $K(y)=K(0)+o(|y|^d)$ in $\mathscr{O}$.*

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 2$, and $K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be an antipodally symmetric function, i.e., $K(\xi) = K(-\xi)\ \forall\ \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n$, and be positive somewhere on $\mathbb{S}^n$. If there exists a maximum point ξ_0 of K at which K has flatness order greater than $n - 2\sigma$, then* (1.5) *has at least one positive C^2 solution.*

For $2 \leq n < 2 + 2\sigma$, $K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ has flatness order greater than $n - 2\sigma$ at every maximum point. When $\sigma = 1$, the above theorem was proved by Escobar and Schoen [46] for $n \geq 3$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $n \geq 2$. Suppose that $K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ is a positive function satisfying that for any critical point ξ_0 of K, in some geodesic normal coordinates $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$ centered at ξ_0, there exist some small neighborhood $\mathscr{O}$ of 0 and positive constants $\beta = \beta(\xi_0) \in (n - 2\sigma, n)$, $\gamma \in (n - 2\sigma, \beta]$ such that $K \in C^{[\gamma],\gamma-[\gamma]}(\mathscr{O})$ (where $[\gamma]$ is the integer part of γ) and*

$$K(y) = K(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j |y_j|^{\beta} + R(y), \quad \text{in } \mathscr{O},$$

where $a_j = a_j(\xi_0) \neq 0$, $\sum_{j=1}^n a_j \neq 0$, $R(y) \in C^{[\beta]-1,1}(\mathscr{O})$ satisfies
$\sum_{s=0}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s R(y)||y|^{-\beta+s} \to 0$ as $y \to 0$. If

$$\sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^n \text{ such that } \nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} K(\xi)=0,\ \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(\xi)<0} (-1)^{i(\xi)} \neq (-1)^n,$$

where

$$i(\xi) = \#\{a_j(\xi) : \nabla_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} K(\xi) = 0, a_j(\xi) < 0, 1 \leq j \leq n\},$$

then (1.5) *has at least one C^2 positive solution. Moreover, there exists a positive constant C depending only on n, σ and K such that for all positive C^2 solutions v of* (1.5)*,*

$$1/C \leq v \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_{C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)} \leq C.$$

For $n = 3, \sigma = 1$, the existence part of the above theorem was established by Bahri and Coron [6], and the compactness part were given in Chang, Gursky and Yang [29] and Schoen and Zhang [88]. For $n \geq 4, \sigma = 1$, the above theorem was proved by Li [68].

We now consider a class of functions K more general than that in Theorem 1.2, which is modified from [68].

Definition 1.2. *For any real number $\beta > 1$, we say that a sequence of functions $\{K_i\}$ satisfies condition $(*)'_\beta$ for some sequence of constants $L(\beta, i)$ in some region Ω_i, if $\{K_i\} \in C^{[\beta],\beta-[\beta]}(\Omega_i)$ satisfies*

$$[\nabla^{[\beta]} K_i]_{C^{\beta-[\beta]}(\Omega_i)} \leq L(\beta, i),$$

and, if $\beta \geq 2$, that

$$|\nabla^s K_i(y)| \leq L(\beta, i) |\nabla K_i(y)|^{(\beta-s)/(\beta-1)},$$

for all $2 \leq s \leq [\beta]$, $y \in \Omega_i$, $\nabla K_i(y) \neq 0$.

Note that the function K in Theorem 1.2 satisfies $(*)'_\beta$ condition.

Remark 1.1. *For $1 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, if $\{K_i\}$ satisfies $(*)'_{\beta_2}$ for some sequences of constants $\{L(\beta_2, i)\}$ in some regions Ω_i, then $\{K_i\}$ satisfies $(*)'_{\beta_1}$ for $\{L(\beta_1, i)\}$, where*

$$L(\beta_1, i) = \begin{cases} L(\beta_2, i) \max\left(\max\limits_{2 \leq s \leq [\beta_1]} \|\nabla K_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_i)}^{\frac{\beta_2 - s}{\beta_2 - 1} - \frac{\beta_1 - s}{\beta_1 - 1}}, \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_i)^{\beta_2 - \beta_1} \right), \ \textit{if } [\beta_2] = [\beta_1] \\ L(\beta_2, i) \max\left(\max\limits_{2 \leq s \leq [\beta_1]} \|\nabla K_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_i)}^{\frac{\beta_2 - s}{\beta_2 - 1} - \frac{\beta_1 - s}{\beta_1 - 1}}, \|\nabla K_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_i)}^{\frac{\beta_2 - [\beta_1] - 1}{\beta_2 - 1}} \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_i)^{1 + [\beta_1] - \beta_1} \right), \\ \hfill \textit{if } [\beta_2] > [\beta_1] \end{cases}$$

in the corresponding regions.

The following theorem gives a priori bounds of solutions in $L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}$ norm.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $n \geq 2$, and $K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a positive function. If there exists some constant $d > 0$ such that K satisfies $(*)'_{(n-2\sigma)}$ for some constant $L > 0$ in $\Omega_d := \{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^n : |\nabla_{g_0} K(\xi)| < d\}$, then for any positive solution $v \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$ of* (1.5),

$$\|v\|_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(\mathbb{S}^n)} \leq C, \tag{1.8}$$

where C depends only on $n, \sigma, \inf_{\mathbb{S}^n} K > 0, \|K\|_{C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)}, L$, and d.

The above theorem was proved by Schoen and Zhang [88] for $n = 3$ and $\sigma = 1$, and by Li [68] for $n \geq 4$ and $\sigma = 1$.

Denote $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$ by the closure of $C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ under the norm

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} v P_\sigma(v) \, \mathrm{d}vol_{g_0}.$$

The estimate (1.8) for the solution v is equivalent to

$$\|v\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)} \leq C.$$

However, the estimate (1.8) is not sufficient to imply L^∞ bound for v on $\mathbb{S}^n$. For instance,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^n} v_{\xi_0, \lambda}^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(\xi) \, \mathrm{d}vol_{g_0} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^n} \mathrm{d}vol_{g_0},$$

but $v_{\xi_0,\lambda}(\xi_0) = \lambda^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} \to \infty$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. Furthermore, a sequence of solutions v_i may blow up at more than one point, and it is the case when $\sigma = 1$ (see [69]). The following theorem shows that the latter situation does not happen when K satisfies a little stronger condition.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $n \geq 2$. Suppose that $\{K_i\} \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ is a sequence of positive functions with uniform $C^{1,1}$ norm and $1/A_1 \leq K_i \leq A_1$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$ for some $A_1 > 0$ independent of i. Suppose also that $\{K_i\}$ satisfying $(*)'_\beta$ condition for some constants $\beta > n - 2\sigma$, $L, d > 0$ in Ω_d. Let $\{v_i\} \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be a sequence of corresponding positive solutions of* (1.5) *and $v_i(\xi_i) = \max_{\mathbb{S}^n} v_i$ for some ξ_i. Then, after passing to a subsequence, $\{v_i\}$ is either bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ or blows up at exactly one point in the strong sense: There exists a sequence of Möbius diffeomorphisms $\{\varphi_i\}$ from $\mathbb{S}^n$ to $\mathbb{S}^n$ satisfying $\varphi_i(\xi_i) = \xi_i$ and $|\det \mathrm{d}\varphi_i(\xi_i)|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}} = v_i^{-1}(\xi_i)$ such that*

$$\|T_{\varphi_i} v_i - 1\|_{C^0(\mathbb{S}^n)} \to 0, \quad \textit{as } i \to \infty,$$

where $T_{\varphi_i} v_i := (v \circ \varphi_i) |\det \mathrm{d}\varphi_i|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}}$.

For $n = 3, \sigma = 1$, the above theorem was established by Chang, Gursky and Yang in [29] and by Schoen and Zhang in [88]. For $n \geq 4, \sigma = 1$, the above theorem was proved by Li in [68].

Möbius diffeomorphisms φ from $\mathbb{S}^n$ to $\mathbb{S}^n$ are those given by $\varphi = \phi \circ F$ where ϕ is a Möbius transformation from $\mathbb{R}^n \cup \{\infty\}$ to $\mathbb{R}^n \cup \{\infty\}$ generated by translations, multiplications by nonzero constant and the inversion $x \to x/|x|^2$.

Our local analysis of solutions of (1.5) relies on a localization method introduced by Caffarelli and Silvestre in [22] for the factional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^\sigma$ on the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, through which (1.5) is connected to a degenerate elliptic differential equation in one dimension higher (see section 2).

The proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 make use of blow up analysis of solutions of (1.5), which is an adaptation of the analysis for $\sigma = 1$ developed in [88] and [68]. Our blow up analysis requires a Liouville type theorem. For the definitions of weak solutions and the space $H_{loc}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+})$ in the following Liouville type theorem we refer to Definition 2.1 and the beginning of section 3.

Theorem 1.5. *Let* $U \in H_{loc}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+})$, $U(X) \geq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ *and* $U \not\equiv 0$, *be a weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U(x,t)) & = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) & = U^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}(x,0), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

Then $U(x,0)$ *takes the form*

$$\left(N_\sigma c_{n,\sigma} 2^{2\sigma}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{4\sigma}} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda^2|x-x_0|^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c_{n,\sigma}$ *is the constant in* (1.5) *and* N_σ *is the constant in* (2.4). *Moreover,*

$$U(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{P}_\sigma(x-y,t)U(y,0)\,\mathrm{d}y$$

for $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$, *where* $\mathcal{P}_\sigma(x)$ *is the kernel given in* (2.2).

Remark 1.2. *If we replace* $U^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}(x,0)$ *by* $U^p(x,0)$ *for* $0 \leq p < \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$ *in* (1.9), *then the only nonnegative solution of* (1.9) *is* $U \equiv 0$. *Moreover, for* $p < 0$, (1.9) *has no positive solution. These can be seen from the proof of Theorem 1.5 with a standard modification (see, e.g., the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [24]). For* $\sigma \in (1/2, 1)$ *and* $1 < p < \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$, *this result has been proved in [40].*

Remark 1.3. *We do not make any assumption on the behavior of* U *near* ∞. *If we assume that* $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$, *the theorem in the case of* $p = \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$ *follows from [36] and [70]. When* $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, *the above theorem can be found in [59], [60], [73], [80] and [72].*

Given the pages needed to present the proofs of all the results, we leave the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and the existence part of Theorem 1.2 to the subsequent paper [63]. The needed ingredients for a proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.2 are all developed in this paper. With these ingredients, the existence part of Theorem 1.2 follows from a perturbation result and a degree argument which are given in [63].

The present paper is organized as the following. In section 2 we derive some properties for solutions of fractional Laplacian equations. In particular we prove that local Schauder estimates hold for positive solutions. In section 3, using the method of moving spheres, we establish Theorem 1.5. This Liouville type theorem and the local Schauder estimates are used in the blow up analysis of solutions of (1.5). In section 4 we establish accurate blow up profiles of solutions of (1.5) near isolated blow up points. In fact most of the estimates hold also for subcritical approximations to such equations as well including in bounded domains of $\mathbb{R}^n$. In section 5, we provide $H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)$ norm a priori estimates, at most one isolated simple blow up point, and $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ norm a priori estimates for solutions of (1.5) under appropriate hypotheses on K. The proofs of Theorem 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 are given in this section. In the Appendix we provide a Kazdan-Warner identity, Lemma 4.4 that is in the same spirit of the classical Bôcher theorem, two lemmas on maximum principles and some complementarities.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 A weighted Sobolev space

Let $\sigma \in (0,1)$, $X = (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $|t|^{1-2\sigma}$ belongs to the Muckenhoupt A_2 class in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, namely, there exists a positive constant C, such that for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$

$$\left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B |t|^{1-2\sigma}\,\mathrm{d}X\right)\left(\frac{1}{|B|}\int_B |t|^{2\sigma-1}\,\mathrm{d}X\right) \leq C.$$

Let D be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Denote $L^2(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ as the Banach space of all measurable functions U, defined on D, for which

$$\|U\|_{L^2(|t|^{1-2\sigma},D)} := \left(\int_D |t|^{1-2\sigma}U^2\,\mathrm{d}X\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

We say that $U \in H(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ if $U \in L^2(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$, and its weak derivatives ∇U exist and belong to $L^2(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$. The norm of U in $H(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ is given by

$$\|U\|_{H(|t|^{1-2\sigma},D)} := \left(\int_D |t|^{1-2\sigma}U^2(X)\,\mathrm{d}X + \int_D |t|^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U(X)|^2\,\mathrm{d}X\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It is clear that $H(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ is a Hilbert space with the inner product

$$\langle U, V\rangle := \int_D |t|^{1-2\sigma}(UV + \nabla U\nabla V)\,\mathrm{d}X.$$

Note that the set of smooth functions $C^\infty(D)$ is dense in $H(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$. Moreover, if D is a domain, i.e. a bounded connected open set, with Lipschitz boundary ∂D, then there exists a linear, bounded extension operator from $H(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ to $H(|t|^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ (see, e.g., [39]).

Let Ω be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Recall that $H^\sigma(\Omega)$ is the fractional Sobolev space defined as

$$H^\sigma(\Omega) := \left\{u \in L^2(\Omega) : \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|}{|x-y|^{\frac{n}{2}+\sigma}} \in L^2(\Omega\times\Omega)\right\}$$

with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H^\sigma(\Omega)} := \left(\int_\Omega u^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega\int_\Omega \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{n+2\sigma}}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/2}.$$

The set of smooth functions $C^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $H^\sigma(\Omega)$. If Ω is a domain with Lipschitz boundary, then there exists a linear, bounded extension operator from $H^\sigma(\Omega)$ to $H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that $H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is equivalent to the following space

$$\left\{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) : |\xi|^\sigma \mathscr{F}(u)(\xi) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\right\}$$

with the norm

$$\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \||\xi|^\sigma \mathscr{F}(\cdot)(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

where $\mathscr{F}$ denotes the Fourier transform operator. It is known that (see, e.g., [76]) there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n and σ such that for $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+) \cap C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+})$, $\|U(\cdot,0)\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}$. Hence by a standard density argument, every $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$ has a well-defined trace $u := U(\cdot,0) \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We define $\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as the closure of the set $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of compact supported smooth functions under the norm

$$\|u\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \||\xi|^\sigma \mathscr{F}(u)(\xi)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Then there exists a constant C depending only on n and σ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|u\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for all } u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{2.1}$$

For any $u \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$, set

$$U(x,t) = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{P}_\sigma(x-\xi,t)u(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi, \quad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ := \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,+\infty), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_\sigma(x,t) = \beta(n,\sigma)\frac{t^{2\sigma}}{(|x|^2+t^2)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}}}$$

with constant $\beta(n,\sigma)$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{P}_\sigma(x,1)\,\mathrm{d}x = 1$. Then $U \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$, $U \in L^2(t^{1-2\sigma}, K)$ for any compact set K in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+}$, and $\nabla U \in L^2(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$. Moreover, U satisfies (see [22])

$$\operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\|\nabla U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)} = N_\sigma \|u\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$-\lim_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) = N_\sigma(-\Delta)^\sigma u(x), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \tag{2.5}$$

in distribution sense, where $N_\sigma = 2^{1-2\sigma}\Gamma(1-\sigma)/\Gamma(\sigma)$. We refer $U = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u]$ in (2.2) to be the *extension* of u for any $u \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

For a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with boundary ∂D, we denote $\partial' D$ as the interior of $\overline{D} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ in $\mathbb{R}^n = \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ and $\partial'' D = \partial D \setminus \partial' D$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let* $D = \Omega \times (0, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $R > 0$ *and* $\partial\Omega$ *be Lipschitz.*

(i) If $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, D) \cap C(D \cup \partial' D)$, *then* $u := U(\cdot, 0) \in H^\sigma(\Omega)$, *and*

$$\|u\|_{H^\sigma(\Omega)} \leq C\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},D)}$$

where C *is a positive constant depending only on* n, σ, R *and* Ω. *Hence every* $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ *has a well-defined trace* $U(\cdot, 0) \in H^\sigma(\Omega)$ *on* $\partial' D$. *Furthermore, there exists* $C_{n,\sigma} > 0$ *depending only on* n *and* σ *such that*

$$\|U(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(\Omega)} \leq C_{n,\sigma}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},D)} \quad \text{for all } U \in C_c^\infty(D \cup \partial' D). \tag{2.6}$$

(ii) If $u \in H^\sigma(\Omega)$, *then there exists* $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ *such that the trace of* U *on* Ω *equals to* u *and*

$$\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},D)} \leq C\|u\|_{H^\sigma(\Omega)}$$

where C *is a positive constant depending only on* n, σ, R *and* Ω.

Proof. The above results are well-known and here we just sketch the proofs. For (i), by the previously mentioned result on the extension operator, there exists $\tilde{U} \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ such that $\tilde{U} = U$ in D and

$$\|\tilde{U}\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},\mathbb{R}^{n+1})} \leq C\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},D)}.$$

Hence by the previously mentioned result on the trace from $H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$ to $H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$\|u\|_{H^\sigma(\Omega)} \leq \|\tilde{U}(\cdot, 0)\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|\tilde{U}\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)} \leq C\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},D)}.$$

For (2.6), we extend U to be zero in the outside of $\overline{D}$ and let V be the extension of $U(\cdot, 0)$ as in (2.2). The inequality (2.6) follows from (2.1), (2.4) and

$$\|\nabla V\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)} \leq \|\nabla U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}$$

where Lemma A.3 is used in the above inequality.

For (ii), since $\partial\Omega$ is Lipschitz, there exists $\tilde{u} \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\tilde{u} = u$ in Ω and $\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C\|u\|_{H^\sigma(\Omega)}$. Then $U = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u]$, the extension of $\tilde{u}$, satisfies (ii). ☐

2.2 Weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations

Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ with $\partial' D \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in L_{loc}^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(\partial' D)$ and $b \in L^1_{loc}(\partial' D)$. Consider

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U(X)) = 0 & \text{in } D \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x, t) = a(x)U(x, 0) + b(x) & \text{on } \partial' D. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

Definition 2.1. *We say that* $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ *is a weak solution (resp. supersolution, subsolution) of* (2.7) *in* D, *if for every nonnegative* $\Phi \in C_c^\infty(D \cup \partial' D)$

$$\int_D t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U \nabla\Phi = (resp.\ \geq, \leq) \int_{\partial' D} aU\Phi + b\Phi. \tag{2.8}$$

We denote $Q_R = B_R \times (0, R)$ where $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the ball with radius R and centered at 0.

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose that* $a(x) \in L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1)$ *and* $b(x) \in L^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(B_1)$. *Let* $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ *be a weak solution of* (2.7) *in* Q_1. *There exists* $\delta > 0$ *depending only on* n *and* σ *such that if* $\|a^+\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1)} < \delta$, *then there exists a constant* C *depending only on* n, σ *and* δ *such that*

$$\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_{1/2})} \leq C(\|U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)} + \|b\|_{L^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(B_1)}).$$

Consequently, if $a \in L^p(B_1)$ *for* $p > \frac{n}{2\sigma}$, *then* C *depends only on* n, σ, $\|a\|_{L^p(B_1)}$.

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(Q_1 \cup \partial' Q_1)$ be a cut-off function which equals to 1 in $Q_{1/2}$ and supported in $Q_{3/4}$. By a density argument, we can choose $\eta^2 U$ as a test function in (2.8). Then we have, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} \eta^2 |\nabla U|^2 \,\mathrm{d}X \leq 4 \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla \eta|^2 U^2 \,\mathrm{d}X + 2 \int_{\partial' Q_1} a^+ (\eta U)^2 + b\eta^2 U \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

By Hölder inequality and Proposition 2.1,

$$\int_{\partial' Q_1} a^+ (\eta U)^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \leq \delta \|\eta U\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(\partial' Q_1)} \leq \delta C(n, \sigma) \|\nabla(\eta U)\|^2_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)}$$

By Young's inequality $\forall\, \varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial' Q_1} b\eta^2 U(\cdot, 0) \,\mathrm{d}x &\leq \varepsilon \|\eta U\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(\partial' Q_1)} + C(\varepsilon) \|b\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(\partial' Q_1)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon C(n, \sigma) \|\nabla(\eta U)\|^2_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)} + C(\varepsilon) \|b\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(\partial' Q_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The first conclusion follows immediately if δ is sufficient small.

If $a \in L^p(B_1)$, we can choose r small such that $\|a\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_r(x_0))} < \delta$ for any ball $B_r(x_0) \subset B_1$. Then $\hat{U}(x, t) = r^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} U(rx + x_0, rt)$ satisfies (2.7) with $\hat{a}(x) = r^{2\sigma} a(rx + x_0)$ and $\hat{b}(x, t) = r^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}} b(rx + x_0)$ in Q_1. Since $\|\hat{a}\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1)} < \delta$, applying the above result to $\hat{U}$, we have

$$\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma}, B_{1/2} \times (0, r/2))} \leq C(\|U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)} + \|b\|_{L^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(B_1)})$$

where C depends only on n, σ, $\|a\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}$. This, together with the fact that (2.7) is uniformly elliptic in $B_1 \times (r/4, 1)$, finishes the proof. □

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose that* $a(x) \in L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1)$. *There exists* $\delta > 0$ *which depends only on* n *and* σ *such that if* $\|a^+\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1)} < \delta$, *then for any* $b(x) \in L^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(B_1)$, *there exists a unique solution in* $H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ *to* (2.7) *with* $U|_{\partial'' Q_1} = 0$.

Proof. We consider the bilinear form

$$B[U, V] := \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U \nabla V \,\mathrm{d}X - \int_{\partial' Q_1} aUV \,\mathrm{d}x, \quad U, V \in \mathcal{A}$$

where $\mathcal{A} := \{U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1) : U|_{\partial'' Q_1} = 0 \text{ in trace sense}\}$. By Proposition 2.1, it is easy to verify that $B[\cdot, \cdot]$ is bounded and coercive provided δ is sufficiently small. Therefore the proposition follows from the Riesz representation theorem. □

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose* $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, D)$ *is a weak supersolution of* (2.7) *in* D *with* $a \equiv b \equiv 0$. *If* $U(X) \geq 0$ *on* $\partial'' D$ *in trace sense, then* $U \geq 0$ *in* D.

Proof. Use U^- as a test function to conclude that $U^- \equiv 0$. ☐

The following result is a refined version of that in [90]. Such De Giorgi-Nash-Moser type theorems for degenerated equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions have been established in [48].

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose* $a, b \in L^p(B_1)$ *for some* $p > \frac{n}{2\sigma}$.

(i) Let $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ *be a weak subsolution of* (2.7) *in* Q_1. *Then* $\forall\ \nu > 0$

$$\sup_{Q_{1/2}} U^+ \leq C(\|U^+\|_{L^\nu(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)} + \|b^+\|_{L^p(B_1)})$$

where $U^+ = \max(0, U)$, *and* $C > 0$ *depends only on* n, σ, p, ν *and* $\|a^+\|_{L^p(B_1)}$.

(ii) Let $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ *be a nonnegative weak supersolution of* (2.7) *in* Q_1. *Then for any* $0 < \mu < \tau < 1, 0 < \nu \leq \frac{n+1}{n}$ *we have*

$$\inf_{Q_\mu} U + \|b^-\|_{L^p(B_1)} \geq C\|U\|_{L^\nu(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_\tau)}$$

where $C > 0$ *depends only on* $n, \sigma, p, \nu, \mu, \tau$ *and* $\|a^-\|_{L^p(B_1)}$.

(iii) Let $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ *be a nonnegative weak solution of* (2.7) *in* Q_1. *Then we have the following Harnack inequality*

$$\sup_{Q_{1/2}} U \leq C(\inf_{Q_{1/2}} U + \|b\|_{L^p(B_1)}), \tag{2.9}$$

where $C > 0$ *depends only on* $n, \sigma, p, \|a\|_{L^p(B_1)}$. *Consequently, there exists* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ *depending only on* $n, \sigma, p, \|a\|_{L^p(B_1)}$ *such that any weak solution* $U(X)$ *of* (2.7) *is of* $C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})$. *Moreover,*

$$\|U\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})} \leq C(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} + \|b\|_{L^p(B_1)})$$

where $C > 0$ *depends only on* $n, \sigma, p, \|a\|_{L^p(B_1)}$.

Proof. The proofs are modifications of those in [90], where the method of Moser iteration is used. Here we only point out the changes. Let $k = \|b^+\|_{L^p(B_1)}$ if $b^+ \not\equiv 0$, otherwise let $k > 0$ be any number which is eventually sent to 0. Define $\overline{U} = U^+ + k$ and, for $m > 0$, let

$$\overline{U}_m = \begin{cases} \overline{U} & \text{if } U < m, \\ k + m & \text{if } U \geq m. \end{cases}$$

Consider the test function

$$\phi = \eta^2(\overline{U}_m^\beta \overline{U} - k^{\beta+1}) \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1),$$

for some $\beta \geq 0$ and some nonnegative function $\eta \in C_c^1(Q_1 \cup \partial' Q_1)$. Direction calculations yield that, with setting $W = \overline{U}_m^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \overline{U}$,

$$\frac{1}{1+\beta} \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla(\eta W)|^2 \leq 16 \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla \eta|^2 W^2 + 4 \int_{\partial' Q_1} (a^+ + \frac{b^+}{k}) \eta^2 W^2. \tag{2.10}$$

By Hölder's inequality and the choice of k, we have

$$\int_{\partial' Q_1} (a^+ + \frac{b^+}{k})\eta^2 W^2 \le (\|a^+\|_{L^p(B_1)} + 1)\|\eta^2 W^2\|_{L^{p'}(B_1)}$$

where $p' = \frac{p}{p-1} < \frac{n}{n-2\sigma}$. Choose $0 < \theta < 1$ such that $\frac{1}{p'} = \theta + \frac{(1-\theta)(n-2\sigma)}{n}$. The interpolation inequality gives that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\|\eta^2 W^2\|_{L^{p'}(B_1)} \le \varepsilon \|\eta W\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(B_1)} + \varepsilon^{-\frac{1-\theta}{\theta}} \|\eta^2 W^2\|_{L^1(B_1)}.$$

By the trace embedding inequality in Proposition 2.1, there exists $C > 0$ depending only on n, σ such that

$$\|\eta W\|^2_{L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(B_1)} \le C \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla(\eta W)|^2.$$

By Lemma 2.3 in [90], there exist $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ both of which depend only on n, σ such that

$$\|\eta^2 W^2\|_{L^1(B_1)} \le \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla(\eta W)|^2 + \varepsilon^{-\frac{\delta}{\theta}} \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}\eta^2 W^2.$$

By choosing ε small, the above inequalities give that

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla(\eta W)|^2 \le C(1+\beta)^{\delta/\theta} \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}(\eta^2 + |\nabla \eta|^2) W^2$$

where C depends only on n, σ and $\|a^+\|_{L^p(B_1)}$. Then the proof of Proposition 3.1 in [90] goes through without any change. This finishes the proof of (i) for $\nu = 2$. Then (i) also holds for any $\nu > 0$ which follows from standard arguments. For part (ii) we choose $k = \|b^-\|_{L^p(B_1)}$ if $b^- \not\equiv 0$, otherwise let $k > 0$ be any number which is eventually sent to 0. Then we can show that there exists some $\nu_0 > 0$ for which (ii) holds, by exactly the same proof of Proposition 3.2 in [90]. Finally use the test function $\phi = \overline{U}^{-\beta}\eta^2$ with $\beta \in (0,1)$ to repeat the proof in (i) to conclude (ii) for $0 < \nu \le \frac{n+1}{n}$. Part (iii) follows from (i), (ii) and standard elliptic equation theory. □

Remark 2.1. *Harnack inequality* (2.9), *without lower order term* b, *has been obtained earlier in [23] using a different method.*

The above proofs can be improved to yield the following result.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose* $a \in L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1), b \in L^p(B_1)$ *with* $p > \frac{n}{2\sigma}$ *and* $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ *is a weak subsolution of* (2.7) *in* Q_1. *There exists* $\delta > 0$ *which depends only on* n *and* σ *such that if* $\|a^+\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1)} < \delta$, *then*

$$\|U^+(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^q(\partial' Q_{1/2})} \le C(\|U^+\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)} + \|b^+\|_{L^p(B_1)}).$$

where $C > 0$ *depends only on* n, p, σ, δ, *and* $q = \min\left(\frac{2(n+1)}{n-2\sigma}, \frac{n(p-1)}{(n-2\sigma)p} \cdot \frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}\right)$.

Remark 2.2. *Analogues estimates were established for* $-\Delta u = a(x)u$ *in [15] (see Theorem 2.3 there) and for* $-\mathrm{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) = a(x)|u|^{p-2}u$ *in [4] (see Lemma 3.1 there).*

Proof of Lemma 2.2. We start from (2.10), where we choose $\beta = \min\left(\frac{2}{n}, \frac{2(2\sigma p-n)}{(n-2\sigma)p}\right)$. By Hölder inequality and Proposition 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial' Q_1}(a^+ + \frac{b^+}{k})\eta^2 W^2 &\leq \delta\|\eta^2 W^2\|_{L^{\frac{n}{n-2\sigma}}(B_1)} + \|\eta^2 W^2\|_{L^{p'}(B_1)}\\ &\leq C(n,\sigma)\delta\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla(\eta W)|^2 + C_{n,\sigma,p}\|\overline{U}\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)}.\end{aligned}$$

By Poincare's inequality in [48], we have

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla\eta|^2 W^2 \leq C_{n,\sigma,p}\|\overline{U}\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)}.$$

If δ is sufficiently small, the the above together with (2.10) imply that

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla(\eta W)|^2 \leq C_{n,\sigma,p}\|\overline{U}\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)}.$$

Hence it follows from Hölder inequality and Proposition 2.1 that, by sending $m\to\infty$,

$$\|\overline{U}(\cdot,0)\|_{L^q(\partial' Q_{1/2})} \leq C_{n,\sigma,p}\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla(\eta W)|^2 \leq C_{n,\sigma,p}\|\overline{U}\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)}.$$

This finishes the proof. □

Corollary 2.1. *Suppose that* $K\in L^\infty(B_1)$, $U\in H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)$ *and* $U\geq 0$ *in* Q_1 *satisfies, for some* $1\leq p\leq (n+2\sigma)(n-2\sigma)$,

$$\begin{cases}\operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U(X)) = 0 & \text{in } Q_1\\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) = K(x)U(x,0)^p & \text{on } \partial' Q_1.\end{cases}$$

Then (i) $U\in L^\infty_{loc}(Q_1\cup\partial' Q_1)$, *and hence* $U(\cdot,0)\in L^\infty_{loc}(B_1)$.

(ii) There exist $C>0$ *and* $\alpha\in(0,1)$ *depending only on* $n,\sigma,p,\|u\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})}$, $\|K\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})}$ *such that* $U\in C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})$ *and*

$$\|U\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_{1/2})} + \|U\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})} \leq C.$$

Note that the regularity of solution of $-\Delta u = u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}$ was proved by Trudinger in [89].

Proof of Corollary 2.1. By Proposition 2.1, $U(\cdot,0)\in H^\sigma(B_1)\subset L^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}(B_1)$. Thus $U(\cdot,0)^{p-1}\in L^{\frac{n}{2\sigma}}(B_1)$. Then part (i) follows from Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.4. Part (ii) follows from Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.4. □

2.3 Local Schauder estimates

Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $a \in L_{loc}^{\frac{2n}{n+2\sigma}}(\Omega)$ and $b \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. We say $u \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a weak solution of

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u = a(x)u + b(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

if for any $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ supported in Ω,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (-\Delta)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} u (-\Delta)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}} \phi = \int_\Omega a(x)u\phi + b(x)\phi.$$

Then by (2.5), $u \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a weak solution of

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u = \frac{1}{N_\sigma}\Big(a(x)u + b(x)\Big) \quad \text{in } B_1$$

if and only if $U = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u]$, the extension of u defined in (2.2), is a weak solution of (2.7) in Q_1.

For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $C^\alpha(\Omega)$ denotes the standard Hölder space over domain Ω. For simplicity, we use $C^\alpha(\Omega)$ to denote $C^{[\alpha],\alpha-[\alpha]}(\Omega)$ when $1 < \alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$ (the set of positive integers).

In this part, we shall prove the following local Schauder estimates for nonnegative solutions of fractional Laplace equation.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose $a(x), b(x) \in C^\alpha(B_1)$ with $0 < \alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$. Let $u \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ be a weak solution of*

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u = a(x)u + b(x), \quad \textit{in } B_1.$$

Suppose that $2\sigma + \alpha$ is not *an integer. Then $u \in C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})$. Moreover,*

$$\|u\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\inf_{B_{3/4}} u + \|b\|_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})}) \tag{2.11}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, \alpha, \|a\|_{C^\alpha(B_{3/4})}$.

Remark 2.3. *Replacing the assumption $u \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by $u \geq 0$ in B_1, estimate* (2.11) *may fail (see [66]). Without the sign assumption of u,* (2.11) *with $\inf_{B_{3/4}} u$ substituted by $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ holds, which is proved in [21], [20] and [19] in a much more general setting of fully nonlinear nonlocal equations.*

The following proposition will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $a(x), b(x) \in C^k(B_1)$, $U(X) \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ be a weak solution of* (2.7) *in Q_1, where k is a positive integer. Then we have*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} \|\nabla_x^i U\|_{L^\infty(Q_{1/2})} \leq C(\|U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)} + \|b\|_{C^k(B_1)}),$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, k, \|a\|_{C^k(B_1)}$.

Proof. We know from Proposition 2.4 that U is Hölder continuous in $\overline{Q_{8/9}}$. Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|h|$ sufficiently small. Denote $U^h(x,t) = \frac{U(x+h,t)-U(x,t)}{|h|}$. Then U^h is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U^h(X)) = 0 & \text{in } Q_{8/9} \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U^h(x,t) = a(x+h)U^h + a^h U + b^h & \text{on } \partial' Q_{8/9}. \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

By Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U^h\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_{2/3})} + \|U^h\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{2/3}})} &\le C(\|U^h\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_{3/4})} + \|b\|_{C^1(B_1)}) \\ &\le C(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_{4/5})} + \|b\|_{C^1(B_1)}) \\ &\le C(\|U\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)} + \|b\|_{C^1(B_1)}) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and positive constant $C > 0$ depending only on $n, \sigma, \|a\|_{C^1(B_1)}$. Hence $\nabla_x U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_{2/3}) \cap C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{2/3}})$, and it is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla(\nabla_x U) = 0 & \text{in } Q_{2/3} \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t(\nabla_x U) = a\nabla_x U + U\nabla_x a + \nabla_x b & \text{on } \partial' Q_{2/3}. \end{cases}$$

Then this Proposition follows immediately from Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.4 for $k = 1$. We can continue this procedure for $k = 2, 3, \cdots$ (by induction). □

To prove Theorem 2.1 we first obtain Schauder estimates for solutions of the equation

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U(X)) = 0 & \text{in } Q_R \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) = g(x) & \text{on } \partial' Q_R. \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Let $U(X) \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_2)$ be a weak solution of (2.13) with $R = 2$ and $g(x) \in C^\alpha(B_2)$ for some $0 < \alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$. If $2\sigma + \alpha$ is not an integer, then $U(\cdot, 0)$ is of $C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})$. Moreover, we have*

$$\|U(\cdot,0)\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \le C(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} + \|g\|_{C^\alpha(B_2)}),$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on n, σ, α.

This theorem together with Proposition 2.4 implies the following

Theorem 2.3. *Let $U(X) \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ be a weak solution of (2.7) with $D = Q_1$ and $a(x), b(x) \in C^\alpha(B_1)$ for some $0 < \alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$. If $2\sigma + \alpha$ is not an integer, then $U(\cdot, 0)$ is of $C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})$. Moreover, we have*

$$\|U(\cdot,0)\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \le C(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} + \|b\|_{C^\alpha(B_1)}),$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, \alpha, \|a\|_{C^\alpha(B_1)}$.

Proof. From Proposition 2.4, U is Hölder continuous in $\overline{Q_{3/4}}$. Theorem 2.3 follows from bootstrap arguments by applying Theorem 2.2 with $g(x) := a(x)U(x,0) + b(x)$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Our arguments are in the spirit of those in [18] and [71]. Denote C as various constants that depend only on n and σ. Let $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, $Q_k = Q_{\rho^k}(0), \partial' Q_k = B_k, k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. (Note that we have abused notations a little bit. Only in this proof we refer Q_k, B_k as Q_{ρ^k}, B_{ρ^k}.) We also denote $M = \|g\|_{C^\alpha(B_2)}$. From Proposition 2.4 we have already known that U is Hölder continuous in $\overline{Q_0}$. First we assume that $\alpha \in (0,1)$

Step 1: We consider the case of $2\sigma + \alpha < 1$. Let W_k be the unique weak solution of (which is guaranteed by Proposition 2.3)

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla W_k(X)) = 0 & \text{in } Q_k \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0^+} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t W_k(x,t) = g(0) - g(x) & \text{on } \partial' Q_k \\ W_k(X) = 0 & \text{on } \partial'' Q_k \end{cases} \tag{2.14}$$

Let $U_k = W_k + U$ in Q_k and $h_{k+1} = U_{k+1} - U_k$ in Q_{k+1}, then

$$\|W_k\|_{L^\infty(Q_k)} \le CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha)k}. \tag{2.15}$$

Indeed (2.15) follows by applying Lemma 2.1 to the equation of $\rho^{-2\sigma k}W_k(\rho^k x) \pm (t^{2\sigma} - 3)M\rho^{\alpha k}$ in Q_0. Hence by weak maximum principle again we have

$$\|h_{k+1}\|_{L^\infty(Q_k)} \le CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha)k}.$$

By Proposition 2.5, we have, for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$

$$\|\nabla_x^i h_{k+1}\|_{L^\infty(Q_{k+2})} \le CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha-i)k}. \tag{2.16}$$

Similarly apply Proposition 2.5 to U_0, we have

$$\|\nabla_x^i U_0\|_{L^\infty(Q_2)} \le C(\|U_0\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} + M) \le C(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)} + M) \tag{2.17}$$

For any given point z near 0, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|U(z,0) - U(0,0)| \\ &\le |U_k(0,0) - U(0,0)| + |U(z,0) - U_k(z,0)| + |U_k(z,0) - U_k(0,0)| \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \end{aligned}$$

Let k be such that $\rho^{k+4} \le |z| \le \rho^{k+3}$. By (2.15),

$$I_1 + I_2 \le CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha)k} \le CM|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha}.$$

For I_3, by (2.16) and (2.17),

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\le |U_0(z,0) - U_0(0,0)| + \sum_{j=1}^{k} |h_j(z,0) - h_j(0,0)| \\ &\le C|z|\Big(\|\nabla_x U_0\|_{L^\infty(Q_{k+3})} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \|\nabla_x h_j\|_{L^\infty(Q_{k+3})}\Big) \\ &\le C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)} + M + M\sum_{j=1}^{k} \rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha-1)j}\Big) \\ &\le C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)} + M(1 + |z|^{2\sigma+\alpha-1})\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $2\sigma+\alpha<1$, we have

$$|U(z,0)-U(0,0)|\le C\big(M+\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}\big)|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha}.$$

which finishes the proof of Step 1.

Step 2: For $1<2\sigma+\alpha<2$, the arguments in Step 1 imply that

$$\|\nabla_x U(\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}\le C\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}+M\Big). \tag{2.18}$$

Apply (2.18) to the equation of W_k we have, together with (2.15),

$$\|\nabla_x W_k(\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty(B_{k+1})}\le CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha-1)k}$$

By (2.16) and (2.17),

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla_x U_k(z,0)-\nabla_x U_k(0,0)|\\
&\le|\nabla_x U_0(z,0)-\nabla_x U_0(0,0)|+\sum_{j=1}^{k}|\nabla_x h_j(z,0)-\nabla_x h_j(0,0)|\\
&\le C|z|\Big(\|\nabla_x^2U_0\|_{L^\infty(Q_{k+3})}+\sum_{j=1}^{k}\|\nabla_x^2h_j\|_{L^\infty(Q_{k+3})}\Big)\\
&\le C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}+M+M\sum_{j=1}^{k}\rho^{(2\sigma-2+\alpha)j}\Big)\\
&\le C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}+M(1+|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha-2})\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla_x U(z,0)-\nabla_x U(0,0)|\\
&\le|\nabla_x W_k(0,0)|+|\nabla_x W_k(z,0)|+|\nabla_x U_k(z,0)-\nabla_x U_k(0,0)|\\
&\le CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha-1)k}+C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}+M(1+|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha-2})\Big)\\
&\le C\big(M+\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}\big)|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of Step 2.

Step 3: For $2\sigma+\alpha>2$, the arguments in Step 2 imply that

$$\|\nabla_x^2 U(\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty(B_1)}\le C\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}+M\Big), \tag{2.19}$$

Apply (2.19) to the equation of W_k we have, together with (2.15),

$$\|\nabla_x^2 W_k(\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty(B_{k+1})}\le CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha-2)k}$$

By (2.16) and (2.17),

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla_x^2 U_k(z,0) - \nabla_x^2 U_k(0,0)| \\
&\leq |\nabla_x^2 U_0(z,0) - \nabla_x^2 U_0(0,0)| + \sum_{j=1}^{k} |\nabla_x^2 h_j(z,0) - \nabla_x^2 h_j(0,0)| \\
&\leq C|z|\Big(\|\nabla_x^3 U_0\|_{L^\infty(Q_{k+3})} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \|\nabla_x^3 h_j\|_{L^\infty(Q_{k+3})}\Big) \\
&\leq C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)} + M + M\sum_{j=1}^{k} \rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha-3)k}\Big) \\
&\leq C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)} + M(1+|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha-3})\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla_x^2 U(z,0) - \nabla_x^2 U(0,0)| \\
&\leq |\nabla_x^2 W_k(0,0)| + |\nabla_x^2 W_k(z,0)| + |\nabla_x^2 U_k(z,0) - \nabla_x U_k(0,0)| \\
&\leq CM\rho^{(2\sigma+\alpha-2)k} + C|z|\Big(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)} + M(1+|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha-3})\Big) \\
&\leq C\big(M + \|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_0)}\big)|z|^{2\sigma+\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of Step 3. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.2 for $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

For the case that $\alpha > 1$, we may apply ∇_x to (2.13) $[\alpha]$ times, as in the proof of Proposition 2.5, and repeat the above three steps. Theorem 2.2 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Since $u \in \dot H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is nonnegative, its extension $U \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ and $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ is a weak solution of (2.7) in Q_1. The theorem follows immediately from Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4. □

Remark 2.4. *Another way to show Theorem 2.1 is the following. Let $u \in \dot H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ be a solution of*

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u = g(x), \quad \text{in } B_1$$

where $g \in C^\alpha(B_1)$. Let η be a nonnegative smooth cut-off function supported in B_1 and equal to 1 in $B_{7/8}$. Let $v \in \dot H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the solution of

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma v = \eta(x)g(x), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

where ηg is considered as a function defined in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and supported in B_1, i.e., v is a Riesz potential of ηg

$$v(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n-2\sigma}{2})}{2^{2\sigma}\pi^{n/2}\Gamma(\sigma)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\eta(y)g(y)}{|x-y|^{n-2\sigma}} \mathrm{d}y.$$

Then if $2\sigma+\alpha$ and α are not integers, we have (see, e.g., [86])

$$\|v\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \leq C(\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|\eta g\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^n)}) \leq C\|g\|_{C^\alpha(B_1)}.$$

Let $w = u - v$ which belongs to $\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma w = 0, \quad \textit{in } B_{7/8}.$$

Let $W = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[w]$ be the extension of w, and $\tilde{W} = W + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. Notice that $\tilde{W}$ is a nonnegative weak solution of (2.7) *with $a \equiv b \equiv 0$ and $D = Q_1$. By Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.4, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|w + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \\
&\leq C\|\tilde{W}\|_{L^2(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_{7/8})} \leq C \inf_{Q_{3/4}} \tilde{W} \leq C(\inf_{Q_{3/4}} u + \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} &\leq \|v\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} + \|w\|_{C^{2\sigma+\alpha}(B_{1/2})} \\
&\leq C(\inf_{B_{3/4}} u + \|g\|_{C^\alpha(B_1)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using bootstrap arguments as that in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we conclude Theorem 2.1.

Remark 2.5. *Indeed, our proofs also lead to the following. If we only assume that $a(x), b(x), g(x) \in L^\infty(B_1)$, and let U, u be those in Theorem 2.2 and in Theorem 2.1 respectively, then the estimates*

$$\|U(\cdot, 0)\|_{C^{2\sigma}(B_{1/2})} \leq C_1(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(B_1)})$$

$$\|u\|_{C^{2\sigma}(B_{1/2})} \leq C_2(\inf_{B_{3/4}} u + \|b\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})})$$

hold provided $\sigma \neq 1/2$, where $C_1 > 0$ depends only on n, σ, α and $C_2 > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, \alpha, \|a\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})}$. For $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, we have the following log-Lipschitz property: for any $y_1, y_2 \in B_{1/4}, y_1 \neq y_2$,

$$\frac{|U(y_1, 0) - U(y_2, 0)|}{|y_1 - y_2|} \leq C_1(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} - \|g\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \log|y_1 - y_2|),$$

$$\frac{|u(y_1) - u(y_2)|}{|y_1 - y_2|} \leq -C_2 \log|y_1 - y_2|(\inf_{B_{3/4}} u + \|b\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})})$$

where $C_1 > 0$ depends only on n, σ and $C_2 > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, \|a\|_{L^\infty(B_{3/4})}$.

Next we have

Lemma 2.3. *(Lemma 4.5 in [23]) Let $g \in C^\alpha(B_1)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $U \in L^\infty(Q_1) \cap H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ be a weak solution of* (2.13)*. Then there exists $\beta \in (0, 1)$ depending only on n, σ, α such that $t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U \in C^\beta(\overline{Q_{1/2}})$. Moreover, there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ depending only on n, σ and β such that*

$$\|t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U\|_{C^\beta(\overline{Q_{1/2}})} \leq C(\|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} + \|g\|_{C^\alpha(B_1)}).$$

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that* $K \in C^1(B_1)$, $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_1)$ *and* $U \geq 0$ *in* Q_1 *is a weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U) = 0, & \text{in } Q_1 \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) = K(x)U^p(x,0), & \text{on } \partial' Q_1, \end{cases} \tag{2.20}$$

where $1 \leq p \leq \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}$*. Then there exist* $C > 0$ *and* $\alpha \in (0,1)$ *both of which depend only on* $n, \sigma, p, \|U\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)}, \|K\|_{C^1(Q_1)}$ *such that*

$$\nabla_x U \quad \text{and} \quad t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U \quad \text{are of} \quad C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})$$

and

$$\|\nabla_x U\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})} + \|t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})} \leq C.$$

Proof. We use C and α to denote various positive constants with dependence specified as in the proposition, which may vary from line to line. By Corollary 2.1, $U \in L^\infty_{loc}(Q_1 \cup \partial' Q_1)$ and

$$\|U\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{8/9}})} \leq C.$$

With the above, we may apply Theorem 2.3 to obtain $U(\cdot, 0) \in C^{1,\sigma}(\overline{B_{7/8}})$ and

$$\|U(\cdot,0)\|_{C^{1,\sigma}(\overline{B_{7/8}})} \leq C.$$

Hence we may differentiate (2.20) with respect to x (which can be justified from the proof of Proposition 2.5) and apply Proposition 2.4 to $\nabla_x U$ to obtain

$$\|\nabla_x U\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})} \leq C.$$

Finally we can apply Lemma 2.3 to obtain

$$\|t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_{1/2}})} \leq C.$$

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1.5

We first introduce some notations. We say that $U \in L^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+})$ if $U \in L^\infty(\overline{Q_R})$ for any $R > 0$. Similarly we say $U \in H_{loc}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+})$ if $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \overline{Q_R})$ for any $R > 0$.

In the following $\mathcal{B}_R(X)$ is denoted as the ball in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with radius R and center X, and $\mathcal{B}^+_R(X)$ as $\mathcal{B}_R(X) \cap \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$. We also write $\mathcal{B}_R(0), \mathcal{B}^+_R(0)$ as $\mathcal{B}_R, \mathcal{B}^+_R$ for short respectively. We start with a Lemma, which is a version of the strong maximum principle.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose* $U(X) \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, D_\varepsilon) \cap C(\mathcal{B}^+_1 \cup B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ *and* $U > 0$ *in* $\mathcal{B}^+_1 \cup B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ *is a weak supersolution of* (2.7) *with* $a \equiv b \equiv 0$ *and* $D = D_\varepsilon := \mathcal{B}^+_1 \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_\varepsilon}$ *for any* $0 < \varepsilon < 1$*, then*

$$\liminf_{(x,t)\to 0} U(x,t) > 0.$$

Proof. For any $\delta > 0$, let

$$V_\delta = U + \frac{\delta}{|(x,t)|^{n-2\sigma}} - \min_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}^+_{0.8}} U.$$

Then V is also a weak supersolution in $D_{\delta^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}}$. Applying Lemma 2.1 to V_δ in $D_{\delta^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}}$ for sufficiently small δ, we have $V_\delta \geq 0$ in $D_{\delta^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}}$. For any $(x,t) \in \mathcal{B}^+_{0.8} \backslash \{0\}$, we have $\lim_{\delta \to 0} V_\delta(x,t) \geq 0$, i.e., $U(x,t) \geq \min_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}^+_{0.8}} U$. $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.5 uses the method of moving spheres and is inspired by [73], [72] and [24]. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda > 0$, we define, $\overline{X} = (x, 0)$, and

$$U_{\overline{X},\lambda}(\xi) := \left(\frac{\lambda}{|\xi - \overline{X}|}\right)^{n-2\sigma} U\left(\overline{X} + \frac{\lambda^2(\xi - \overline{X})}{|\xi - \overline{X}|^2}\right), \quad \xi \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \backslash \{\overline{X}\}, \tag{3.1}$$

the Kelvin transformation of U with respect to the ball $\mathcal{B}_\lambda(\overline{X})$. We point out that if U is a solution of (1.9), then $U_{\bar{x},\lambda}$ is a solution of (1.9) in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_\varepsilon}$, for every $\bar{x} \in \partial \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$, $\lambda > 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$.

By Corollary 2.1 any nonnegative weak solution U of (1.9) belongs to $L^\infty_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+})$, and hence by Proposition 2.4, U is Hölder continuous and positive in $\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+}$. By Theorem 2.2, $U(\cdot, 0)$ is smooth in $\mathbb{R}^n$. From classical elliptic equations theory, U is smooth in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a positive constant $\lambda_0(x)$ such that for any $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0(x)$,*

$$U_{\overline{X},\lambda}(\xi) \leq U(\xi), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \backslash \mathcal{B}^+_\lambda(\overline{X}). \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $x = 0$ and write $U_\lambda = U_{0,\lambda}$.

Step 1. We show that there exist $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ which may depend on x, such that

$$U_\lambda(\xi) \leq U(\xi), \ \forall\, 0 < \lambda < \lambda_1, \ \lambda < |\xi| < \lambda_2.$$

For every $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, $\xi \in \partial'' \mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}$, we have $\frac{\lambda^2 \xi}{|\xi|^2} \in \mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}$. Thus we can choose $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(\lambda_2)$ small such that

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(\xi) &= \left(\frac{\lambda}{|\xi|}\right)^{n-2\sigma} U\left(\frac{\lambda^2 \xi}{|\xi|^2}\right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)^{n-2\sigma} \sup_{\overline{\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}}} U \leq \inf_{\partial'' \mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}} U \leq U(\xi) \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$U_\lambda \leq U \quad \text{on } \partial''(\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2} \backslash \mathcal{B}^+_\lambda)$$

for all $\lambda_2 > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(\lambda_2)$.

We will show that $U_\lambda \leq U$ on $(\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2} \backslash \mathcal{B}^+_\lambda)$ if λ_2 is small and $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1(\lambda_2)$. Since U_λ satisfies (1.9) in $\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_1}}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla (U_\lambda - U)) &= 0, \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2} \backslash \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda}; \\ \lim\limits_{t \to 0} t^{1-2\sigma} \partial_t (U_\lambda - U) &= U^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}(x,0) - U_\lambda^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}(x,0), \quad \text{on} \quad \partial'(\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2} \backslash \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda}). \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

Let $(U_\lambda - U)^+ := \max(0, U_\lambda - U)$ which equals to 0 on $\partial''(\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\backslash\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda)$. Hence, by a density argument, we can use $(U_\lambda - U)^+$ as a test function in the definition of weak solution of (3.3). We will make use of the narrow domain technique from [11]. With the help of the mean value theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\backslash\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla(U_\lambda - U)^+|^2 \\
&= \int_{B_{\lambda_2}\backslash B_\lambda} (U_\lambda^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}(x,0) - U^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}(x,0))(U_\lambda - U)^+ \\
&\le C\int_{B_{\lambda_2}\backslash B_\lambda} ((U_\lambda - U)^+)^2 U_\lambda^{\frac{4\sigma}{n-2\sigma}} \\
&\le C\left(\int_{B_{\lambda_2}\backslash B_\lambda} ((U_\lambda - U)^+)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{n}} \left(\int_{B_{\lambda_2}\backslash B_\lambda} U_\lambda^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}} \\
&\le C\left(\int_{\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\backslash\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla(U_\lambda - U)^+|^2\right)\left(\int_{B_{\lambda_2}} U^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}}
\end{aligned}$$

where Proposition 2.1 is used in the last inequality and C is a positive constant depending only on n and σ. We fix λ_2 small such that

$$C\left(\int_{B_{\lambda_2}} U^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{2\sigma}{n}} < 1/2.$$

Then $\nabla(U_\lambda - U)^+ = 0$ in $\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\backslash\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda$. Since $(U_\lambda - U)^+ = 0$ on $\partial''(\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\backslash\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda)$, $(U_\lambda - U)^+ = 0$ in $\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\backslash\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda$. We conclude that $U_\lambda \le U$ on $(\mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\backslash\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda)$ for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1 := \lambda_1(\lambda_2)$.

Step 2. We show that there exists $\lambda_0 \in (0, \lambda_1)$ such that $\forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$

$$U_\lambda(\xi) \le U(\xi),\ |\xi| > \lambda_2,\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

Let $\phi(\xi) = \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{|\xi|}\right)^{n-2\sigma} \inf\limits_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}} U$, which satisfies

$$\begin{cases}\operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\phi) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^+_{\lambda_2}\\ -\lim_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t\phi(x,t) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B_{\lambda_2}},\end{cases}$$

and $\phi(\xi) \le U(\xi)$ on $\partial''\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}$. By the weak maximum principle Lemma 2.1,

$$U(\xi) \ge \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{|\xi|}\right)^{n-2\sigma} \inf_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}} U,\ \forall\ |\xi| > \lambda_2,\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

Let $\lambda_0 = \min(\lambda_1, \lambda_2(\inf\limits_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}} U/\sup\limits_{\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}} U)^{\frac{1}{n-2\sigma}})$. Then for any $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0,\ |\xi| \ge \lambda_2$, we have

$$U_\lambda(\xi) \le (\frac{\lambda}{|\xi|})^{n-2\sigma} U(\frac{\lambda^2\xi}{|\xi|^2}) \le (\frac{\lambda_0}{|\xi|})^{n-2\sigma} \sup_{\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}} U \le (\frac{\lambda_2}{|\xi|})^{n-2\sigma} \inf_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_2}} U \le U(\xi).$$

Lemma 3.1 is proved. □

With Lemma 3.1, we can define for all $x \in R^n$,

$$\bar{\lambda}(x) = \sup\{\mu > 0 : U_{\overline{X},\lambda} \le U \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^+_\lambda, \ \forall\, 0 < \lambda < \mu\}.$$

By Lemma 3.1, $\bar{\lambda}(x) \ge \lambda_0(x)$.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\bar{\lambda}(x) < \infty$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then*

$$U_{\overline{X},\bar{\lambda}(x)} \equiv U.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $x = 0$ and write $U_\lambda = U_{0,\lambda}$ and $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(0)$. By the definition of $\bar{\lambda}$,

$$U_{\bar{\lambda}} \ge U \text{ in } \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_{\bar{\lambda}}} \setminus \{0\},$$

and therefore, for all $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{\lambda}$,

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla (U_\lambda - U)) & = 0, \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{B}^+_\lambda \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_\varepsilon}; \\ -\lim\limits_{t \to 0} t^{1-2\sigma} \partial_t (U_\lambda - U) & \ge 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial'(\mathcal{B}^+_\lambda \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_\varepsilon}). \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

We argue by contradiction. If $U_{\bar{\lambda}}$ is not identically equal to U, applying the Harnack inequality Proposition 2.4 to (3.4), we have

$$U_{\bar{\lambda}} > U \text{ in } \overline{\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\lambda}}} \setminus \{\{0\} \cup \partial'' \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\lambda}}\},$$

and in view of Proposition 3.1,

$$\liminf_{\xi \to 0} (U_{\bar{\lambda}}(\xi) - U(\xi)) > 0.$$

So there exist $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that $U_{\bar{\lambda}}(\xi) > U(0) + c, \ \forall\, 0 < |\xi| < \varepsilon_1$. Choose ε_2 small such that

$$\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon_2}\right)^{n-2\sigma} (U(0) + c) > U(0) + \frac{c}{2}.$$

Thus for all $0 < |\xi| < \varepsilon_1$ and $\bar{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon_2$,

$$U_\lambda(\xi) = \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda}\right)^{n-2\sigma} U_{\bar{\lambda}}\left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}^2 \xi}{\lambda^2}\right) \ge \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon_2}\right)^{n-2\sigma} (U(0) + c) \ge U(0) + c/2.$$

Choose ε_3 small such that for all $0 < |\xi| < \varepsilon_3$, $U(0) > U(\xi) - c/4$. Hence for all $0 < |\xi| < \varepsilon_3$ and $\bar{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon_2$,

$$U_\lambda(\xi) > U(\xi) + c/4.$$

For δ small, which will be fixed later, denote $K_\delta = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ : \varepsilon_3 \le |\xi| \le \bar{\lambda} - \delta\}$. Then there exists $c_2 = c_2(\delta)$ such that

$$U_{\bar{\lambda}}(X) - U(X) > c_2 \ \text{ in } \ K_\delta.$$

By the uniform continuous of U on compact sets, there exists $\varepsilon_4 \le \varepsilon_2$ such that for all $\bar{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon_4$

$$U_\lambda - U_{\bar{\lambda}} > -c_2/2 \ \text{ in } \ K_\delta.$$

Hence

$$U_\lambda - U > c_2/2 \ \text{ in } \ K_\delta.$$

Now let us focus on the region $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ : \bar{\lambda} - \delta \le |\xi| \le \lambda\}$. Using the narrow domain technique as that in Lemma 3.1, we can choose δ small (notice that we can choose ε_4 as small as we want) such that

$$U_\lambda \ge U \ \text{ in } \ \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ : \bar{\lambda} - \delta \le |\xi| \le \lambda\}.$$

In conclusion there exists ε_4 such that for all $\bar{\lambda} < \lambda < \bar{\lambda} + \varepsilon_4$

$$U_\lambda \ge U \ \text{ in } \ \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ : 0 < |\xi| \le \lambda\}$$

which contradicts with the definition of $\bar{\lambda}$. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.5. It follows from the same arguments in [72], with the help of Lemma 3.2, that:
(i) Either $\bar{\lambda}(x) = \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ or $\bar{\lambda}(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$; (Lemma 2.3 in [72])
(ii) If for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\bar{\lambda}(x) = \infty$ then $U(x,t) = U(0,t), \ \forall \, (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$; (Lemma 11.3 in [72])
(iii) If $\bar{\lambda}(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then by Lemma 11.1 in [72]

$$u(x) := U(x,0) = a\left(\frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda^2|x - x_0|^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}} \tag{3.5}$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $a > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

We claim that (ii) never happens, since this would imply, using (1.9), that

$$U(x,t) = U(0) - U(0)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}\frac{t^{2\sigma}}{2\sigma}$$

which contradicts to the positivity of U. Then (iii) holds.

We are only left to show that $V := U - \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u] \equiv 0$ where $u(x)$ is given in (3.5) and belongs to $\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence, V satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla V) &= 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ \\ \qquad\qquad V &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 3.2, we know that $V_{\bar{\lambda}}$ can be extended to a smooth function near 0. Multiplying the above equation by V and integrating by parts, it leads to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V|^2 = 0$. Hence we have $V \equiv 0$.

Finally $a = \left(N_\sigma c_{n,\sigma} 2^{2\sigma}\right)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{4\sigma}}$ follows from (1.3) with $\phi = 1$ and (2.5).

☐

4 Local analysis near isolated blow up points

The analysis in this and next section adapts the blow up analysis developed in [88] and [68] to give accurate blow up profiles for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations. For $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, similar results have been proved in [57] and [45], where equations are elliptic.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ $(n \geq 2)$ be a domain, $\tau_i \geq 0$ satisfy $\lim_{i\to\infty} \tau_i = 0$, $p_i = (n+2\sigma)/(n-2\sigma) - \tau_i$, and $K_i \in C^{1,1}(\Omega)$ satisfy, for some constants $A_1, A_2 > 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} 1/A_1 \leq K_i(x) &\leq A_1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega, \\ \|K_i\|_{C^{1,1}(\Omega)} &\leq A_2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Let $u_i \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_i \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u_i = c(n,\sigma) K_i(x) u_i^{p_i}, \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{4.2}$$

We say that $\{u_i\}$ blows up if $\|u_i\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$.

Definition 4.1. *Suppose that $\{K_i\}$ satisfies (4.1) and $\{u_i\}$ satisfies (4.2). We say a point $\overline{y} \in \Omega$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ if there exist $0 < \overline{r} <$ dist$(\overline{y}, \Omega)$, $\overline{C} > 0$, and a sequence y_i tending to $\overline{y}$, such that, y_i is a local maximum of u_i, $u_i(y_i) \to \infty$ and*

$$u_i(y) \leq \overline{C} |\overline{y} - y_i|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \textit{for all } y \in B_{\overline{r}}(y_i).$$

Let $y_i \to \overline{y}$ be an isolated blow up of u_i, define

$$\overline{u}_i(r) = \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{\partial B_r(y_i)} u_i, \quad r > 0, \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\overline{w}_j(r) = r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \overline{u}_i(r), \quad r > 0.$$

Definition 4.2. *We say $y_i \to \overline{y} \in \Omega$ is an isolated simple blow up point, if $y_i \to \overline{y}$ is an isolated blow up point, such that, for some $\rho > 0$ (independent of i) $\overline{w}_i$ has precisely one critical point in $(0, \rho)$ for large i.*

In this section, we are mainly concerned with the profile of blow up of $\{u_i\}$. And under certain conditions, we can show that isolated blow up points have to be isolated simple blow up points.

Let $u_i \in C^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u_i \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy (4.2) with K_i satisfying (4.1). Without loss of generality, we assume throughout this section that $B_2 \subset \Omega$ and $y_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ in Ω. Let $U_i = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u_i]$ be the extension of u_i (see (2.2)). Then we have

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla U_i) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma} \dfrac{\partial U_i(x,t)}{\partial t} = c_0 K_i(x) U_i(x,0)^{p_i}, & \text{for any } x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

where $c_0 = N_\sigma c(n,\sigma)$ with $N_\sigma = 2^{1-2\sigma}\Gamma(1-\sigma)/\Gamma(\sigma)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $u_i \in C^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u_i \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies (4.2) with $\{K_i\}$ satisfying (4.1), and $y_i \to 0$ is an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$, i.e., for some positive constants A_3 and $\bar{r}$ independent of i,*

$$|y - y_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(y) \leq A_3, \quad \textit{for all } y \in B_{\bar{r}} \subset \Omega. \tag{4.5}$$

Denote $U_i = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u_i]$, and $Y_i = (y_i, 0)$. Then for any $0 < r < \frac{1}{3}\bar{r}$, we have the following Harnack inequality

$$\sup_{\mathcal{B}^+_{2r}(Y_i) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_{r/2}(Y_i)}} U_i \leq C \inf_{\mathcal{B}^+_{2r}(Y_i) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}^+_{r/2}(Y_i)}} U_i,$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on $n, \sigma, A_3, \bar{r}$ and $\sup\limits_i \|K_i\|_{L^\infty(B_{\overline{r}}(y_i))}$.

Proof. For $0 < r < \frac{\bar{r}}{3}$, set

$$V_i(Y) = r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} U_i(Y_i + rY), \quad \text{in } Y \in \mathcal{B}_3^+.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla V_i) = 0, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}_3^+,$$

and

$$-\lim_{s\to 0} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s V_i(y,s) = c_0 K(y_i + ry) V_i(y,0)^{p_i}, \quad \text{on } \partial'\mathcal{B}_3^+.$$

Since $y_i \to 0$ is an isolated blow up point of u_i,

$$V_i(y,0) \le A_3 |y|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)}, \quad \text{for all } y \in B_3.$$

Lemma 4.1 follows after applying Proposition 2.4 and the standard Harnack inequality for uniform elliptic equation together to V_i in the domain $Q_2 \setminus \overline{Q}_{1/2}$. ☐

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $u_i \in C^2(\Omega) \cap \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u_i \ge 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies (4.2) with $K_i \in C^{1,1}(\Omega)$ satisfying (4.1). Suppose also that $y_i \to 0$ be an isolated blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ with* (4.5). *Then for any $R_i \to \infty$, $\varepsilon_i \to 0^+$, we have, after passing to a subsequence (still denoted as $\{u_i\}$, $\{y_i\}$, etc. ...), that*

$$\|m_i^{-1} u_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} \cdot + y_i) - (1 + k_i|\cdot|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}\|_{C^2(B_{2R_i}(0))} \le \varepsilon_i,$$

$$R_i m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} \to 0 \quad \textit{as} \quad i \to \infty,$$

where $m_i = u_i(y_i)$ and $k_i = K_i(y_i)^{1/\sigma}/4$.

Proof. Let

$$\phi_i(x) = m_i^{-1} u_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} x + y_i), \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^\sigma \phi_i(x) &= c(n,\sigma) K_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} x + y_i)\phi_i^{p_i}, \\ 0 < \phi_i &\le A_3 |x|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)}, \quad |x| < \overline{r} m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\phi_i(0) = 1, \quad \nabla\phi_i(0) = 0.$$

Let $\Phi_i = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[\phi_i]$ be the extension of ϕ_i (see (2.2)). Then Φ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\Phi_i(x,t)) &= 0, \quad |x,t| < \bar{r} m_i^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}, \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t\Phi_i(x,t) &= N_\sigma c(n,\sigma) K_i(m_i^{-\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}} x + y_i)\Phi_i(x,0)^{p_i}, \quad |x| < \bar{r} m_i^{\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}. \end{cases}$$

By the weak maximum principle we have, for any $0 < r < 1$, $1 = \phi_i(0) = \Phi_i(0,0) \ge \min\limits_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r} \Phi_i$. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that

$$\max_{\partial B_r} \phi_i \le \max_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r} \Phi_i \le C \min_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r} \Phi_i \le C.$$

Namely,

$$\max_{\overline{B_1}} \phi_i \leq C$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on n, σ, A_1, A_2, A_3. This and (4.6) implies that for any $R > 1$

$$\max_{\overline{B_R}} \phi_i \leq C(R)$$

for some $C(R) > 0$ depending on n, σ, A_1, A_2, A_3 and R. Then by Corollary 2.1 there exists some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ such that for every $R > 1$,

$$\|\Phi_i\|_{H(t^{1-2\sigma}, Q_R)} + \|\Phi_i\|_{C^\alpha(\overline{Q_R})} \leq C_1(R),$$

where α and $C_1(R)$ are independent of i. Bootstrap using Theorem 2.1, we have, for every $0 < \beta < 2$ with $2\sigma + \beta \notin \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\phi_i\|_{C^{2\sigma+\beta}(\overline{B_R})} \leq C_2(R, \beta)$$

where $C_2(R,\beta)$ is independent of i. Thus, after passing to a subsequence, we have, for some non-negative functions $\Phi(X) \in H_{loc}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}) \cap C^\alpha_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}})$ and $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_i & \rightharpoonup \Phi \quad \text{weakly in } H_{loc}(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+), \\ \Phi_i & \to \Phi \quad \text{in } C^{\alpha/2}_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+}), \\ \phi_i & \to \phi \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n). \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\Phi(\cdot, 0) \equiv \phi, \quad \phi(0) = 1, \quad \nabla\phi(0) = 0,$$

and Φ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\Phi) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t\Phi(x,t) = c_0 K \Phi(x,0)^{(n+2\sigma)/(n-2\sigma)} & \text{on } \partial'\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \end{cases}$$

with $K = \lim\limits_{i\to\infty} K_i(y_i)$. By Theorem 1.5, we have

$$\phi(x) = (1 + \lim_{i\to\infty} k_i |x|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2},$$

where $k_i = K_i(y_i)^{1/\sigma}/4$. Proposition 4.1 follows immediately. □

Note that since passing to subsequences does not affect our proofs, we will always choose $R_i \to \infty$ first, and then $\varepsilon_i \to 0^+$ as small as we wish (depending on R_i) and then choose our subsequence $\{u_i\}$ to work with.

Proposition 4.2. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 4.1, there exists some positive constant $C = C(n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, A_3)$ such that,*

$$u_i(y) \geq C^{-1} m_i (1 + k_i m_i^{(p_i-1)/\sigma} |y - y_i|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}, \quad |y - y_i| \leq 1.$$

In particular, for any $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|e| = 1$, we have

$$u_i(y_i + e) \geq C^{-1} m_i^{-1+((n-2\sigma)/2\sigma)\tau_i}.$$

where $\tau_i = (n+2\sigma)/(n-2\sigma) - p_i$.

Proof. Denote $r_i = R_i m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}$. It follows from Proposition 4.1 that $r_i \to 0$ and

$$u_i(y) \geq C^{-1} m_i R_i^{2\sigma-n}, \quad \text{for all } |y-y_i| = r_i.$$

By the Harnack inequality Lemma 4.1, we have

$$U_i(Y) \geq C^{-1} m_i R_i^{2\sigma-n}, \quad \text{for all } |Y-Y_i| = r_i,$$

where $U_i = \mathcal{P}_\sigma[u_i]$ is the extension of u_i, $Y=(y,s)$ with $s \geq 0$, and $Y_i = (y_i, 0)$.

Set

$$\Psi_i(Y) = C^{-1} R_i^{2\sigma-n} r_i^{n-2\sigma} m_i(|Y-Y_i|^{2\sigma-n} - (\frac{3}{2})^{2\sigma-n}), \quad r_i \leq |Y-Y_i| \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

Clearly, Ψ_i satisfies

$$\begin{gathered} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\Psi_i) = 0 = \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U_i), \quad r_i \leq |Y-Y_i| \leq \frac{3}{2}, \\ \Psi_i(Y) \leq U_i(Y), \quad \text{on } \partial''\mathcal{B}_{r_i} \cup \partial''\mathcal{B}_{3/2}, \\ -\lim_{s\to 0^+} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s\Psi_i(y,s) = 0 \leq -\lim_{s\to 0^+} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s U_i(y,s), \qquad r_i \leq |y-y_i| \leq \frac{3}{2}. \end{gathered}$$

By the weak maximum principle Lemma 2.1 applied to $U_i - \Psi_i$, we have

$$U_i(Y) \geq \Psi_i(Y) \quad \text{for all } r_i \leq |Y-Y_i| \leq \frac{3}{2}.$$

Therefore, Proposition 4.2 follows immediately from Proposition 4.1. □

Lemma 4.2. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 4.1, and in addition that $y_i \to 0$ is also an isolated simple blow up point with the constant ρ, there exist $\delta_i > 0$, $\delta_i = O(R_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)})$, such that*

$$u_i(y) \leq C_1 u_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i} |y-y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i}, \quad \textit{for all } r_i \leq |y-y_i| \leq 1,$$

where $\lambda_i = (n-2\sigma-\delta_i)(p_i-1)/2\sigma - 1$ and C_1 is some positive constant depending only on n, σ, A_1, A_3 and ρ.

Proof. From Proposition 4.1, we see that

$$u_i(y) \leq C u_i(y_i) R_i^{2\sigma-n} \quad \text{for all } |y-y_i| = r_i. \tag{4.7}$$

Let $\overline{u}_i(r)$ be the average of u_i over the sphere of radius r centered at y_i. It follows from the assumption of isolated simple blow up and Proposition 4.1 that

$$r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r) \quad \text{is strictly decreasing for } r_i < r < \rho. \tag{4.8}$$

By Lemma 4.1, (4.8) and (4.7), we have, for all $r_i < |y-y_i| < \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} |y-y_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(y) &\leq C|y-y_i|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(|y-y_i|) \\ &\leq r_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r_i) \\ &\leq C R_i^{\frac{2\sigma-n}{2}+o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ denotes some quantity tending to 0 as $i \to \infty$. Applying Lemma 4.1 again, we obtain

$$U_i(Y)^{p_i-1} \le O(R_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)})|Y-Y_i|^{-2\sigma} \quad \text{for all } r_i \le |Y-Y_i| \le \rho. \tag{4.9}$$

Consider operators

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{L}(\Phi) = \mathrm{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla\Phi(Y)), & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_2^+, \\ L_i(\Phi) = -\lim\limits_{s\to 0^+} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s\Phi(y,s) - c_0K_iu_i^{p_i-1}(y)\Phi(y,0), & \text{on } \partial'\mathcal{B}_2^+. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $U_i > 0$ satisfies $\mathfrak{L}(U_i) = 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_2^+$ and $L_i(U_i) = 0$ on $\partial'\mathcal{B}_2^+$.

For $0 \le \mu \le n-2\sigma$, a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{L}(|Y-Y_i|^{-\mu} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-(\mu+2\sigma)}) \\ &= s^{1-2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-(\mu+2)}\Big\{-\mu(n-2\sigma-\mu) + \frac{\varepsilon(\mu+2\sigma)(n-\mu)s^{2\sigma}}{|Y-Y_i|^{2\sigma}}\Big\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$L_i(|Y-Y_i|^{-\mu} - \varepsilon s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-(\mu+2\sigma)}) = |Y-Y_i|^{-(u+2\sigma)}(2\varepsilon\sigma - c_0K_iu_i^{p_i-1}|Y-Y_i|^{2\sigma}).$$

It follows from (4.9) that we can choose $\varepsilon_i = O(R_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)}) > 0$, and then choose $\delta_i = O(R_i^{-2\sigma+o(1)}) > 0$ such that for $r_i < |y-y_i| < \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} &L_i(|Y-Y_i|^{-\delta_i} - \varepsilon_i s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-(\delta_i+2\sigma)}) \ge 0, \\ &L_i(|Y-Y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i} - \varepsilon_i s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-n+\delta_i}) \ge 0 \end{aligned}$$

and for $r_i < |Y-Y_i| < \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{L}(|Y-Y_i|^{-\delta_i} - \varepsilon_i s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-(\delta_i+2\sigma)}) \le 0, \\ &\mathfrak{L}(|Y-Y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i} - \varepsilon_i s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-n+\delta_i}) \le 0. \end{aligned}$$

Set $M_i = 2\max_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_\rho^+} U_i$, $\lambda_i = (n-2\sigma-\delta_i)(p_i-1)/2\sigma - 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i =& M_i\rho^{\delta_i}(|Y-Y_i|^{-\delta_i} - \varepsilon_i s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-(\delta_i+2\sigma)}) \\ &+ 2Au_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i}(|Y-Y_i|^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i} - \varepsilon_i s^{2\sigma}|Y-Y_i|^{-n+\delta_i}), \end{aligned}$$

where $A > 1$ will be chosen later. By the choice of M_i and λ_i, we immediately have

$$\Phi_i(Y) \ge M_i \ge U_i(Y) \quad \text{for all } |Y-Y_i| = \rho.$$

$$\Phi_i \ge AU_i(Y_i)R_i^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i} \ge AU_i(Y_i)R_i^{2\sigma-n} \quad \text{for all } |Y-Y_i| = r_i.$$

Due to (4.9), we can choose A to be sufficiently large such that

$$\Phi_i \ge U_i \quad \text{for all } |Y-Y_i| = r_i.$$

Therefore, applying maximum principles in section A.3 to $\Phi_i - U_i$ in $\mathcal{B}_\rho \backslash \overline{\mathcal{B}_{r_i}}$, it yields

$$U_i \le \Phi_i \quad \text{for all } r_i \le |Y-Y_i| \le \rho.$$

For $r_i < \theta < \rho$, the same arguments as that in (4.9) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}M_i &\le C\rho^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(\rho)\\ &\le C\theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(\theta)\\ &\le C\theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\{M_i\rho^{\delta_i}\theta^{-\delta_i} + Au_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i}\theta^{2\sigma-n+\delta_i}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\theta = \theta(n,\sigma,\rho,A_1,A_2,A_3)$ sufficiently small so that

$$C\theta^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\rho^{\delta_i}\theta^{-\delta_i} \le \frac{1}{2}\rho^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}.$$

It follows that

$$M_i \le Cu_i(y_i)^{-\lambda_i}.$$

Then Lemma 4.2 follows from the above and the Harnack inequality. $\square$

Below we are going to improve the estimate in Lemma 4.2. First, we prove a Pohozaev type identity.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that $K \in C^1(B_{2R})$. Let $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+)$ and $U \ge 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+$ be a weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases}\mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U) = 0, & \textit{in } \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+\\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) = K(x)U^p(x,0), & \textit{on } \partial'\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+,\end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

where $p > 0$. Then

$$\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_R^+} B'(X,U,\nabla U,R,\sigma) + \int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_R^+} t^{1-2\sigma}B''(X,U,\nabla U,R,\sigma) = 0, \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$B'(X,U,\nabla U,R,\sigma) = \frac{n-2\sigma}{2}KU^{p+1} + \langle X,\nabla U\rangle KU^p$$

and

$$B''(X,U,\nabla U,R,\sigma) = \frac{n-2\sigma}{2}U\frac{\partial U}{\partial\nu} - \frac{R}{2}|\nabla U|^2 + R|\frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu}|^2.$$

Proof. Let $\Omega_\varepsilon = \mathcal{B}_R^+ \cap \{t > \varepsilon\}$ for small $\varepsilon > 0$. Multiplying (4.10) by $\langle X,\nabla U\rangle$ and integrating by parts in Ω_ε, we have, with notations $\partial'\Omega_\varepsilon =$ interior of $\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon} \cap \{t=\varepsilon\}$, $\partial''\Omega_\varepsilon = \partial\Omega_\varepsilon \setminus \partial'\Omega_\varepsilon$ and $\nu =$ unit outer normal of $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} &-\int_{\partial'\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U\langle X,\nabla U\rangle + \int_{\partial''\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}R|\frac{\partial U}{\partial\nu}|^2\\ =& \quad \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}X\cdot\nabla(|\nabla U|^2)\\ =& \quad -\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial''\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}R|\nabla U|^2\\ & \quad -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial'\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{2-2\sigma}|\nabla U|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Multiplying (4.10) by U and integrating by parts in Ω_ε, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U|^2 = -\int_{\partial'\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma} U \partial_t U + \int_{\partial''\Omega_\varepsilon} t^{1-2\sigma}\frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu} U. \tag{4.13}$$

By Corollary 2.1 and Proposition 2.6, there exists some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ such that U, $\nabla_x U$, and $t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U$ belong to $C^\alpha(\overline{\mathcal{B}_r^+})$ for all $r < 2R$. With this we can send $\varepsilon \to 0$ as follows. By (4.10),

$$-t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) \to K(x)U^p(x,0) \quad \text{uniformly in } \mathcal{B}_{3R/2} \text{ as } t \to 0.$$

Hence (4.11) follows by sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ in (4.12) and (4.13). $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 4.2, we have*

$$\tau_i = O(u_i(y_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)+o(1)}),$$

and thus

$$u_i(y_i)^{\tau_i} = 1 + o(1).$$

Proof. Since U_i satisfies (4.4) and $\operatorname{div}(y-y_i) = n$, we have, using integration by part,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{c_0}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} B'(Y, U_i, \nabla U_i, 1, \sigma)\\
&= \frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \operatorname{div}(y-y_i) K_i U^{p_i+1}\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \langle y-y_i, \nabla_y U_i^{p_i+1}\rangle K_i\\
&= -\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \Big[\langle y-y_i, \nabla_y K_i\rangle U_i^{p_i+1} + \langle y-y_i, \nabla_y U_i^{p_i+1}\rangle K_i\Big]\\
&\quad + \frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{\partial B_1(y_i)} K_i U_i^{p_i+1} + \frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \langle y-y_i, \nabla_y U_i^{p_i+1}\rangle K_i\\
&= \frac{\tau_i(n-2\sigma)^2}{2n(2n-\tau_i(n-2\sigma))}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \langle y-y_i, \nabla_y U_i^{p_i+1}\rangle K_i\\
&\quad - \frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \langle y-y_i, \nabla_y K_i\rangle U_i^{p_i+1} + \frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{\partial B_1(y_i)} K_i U_i^{p_i+1}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \langle y-y_i, \nabla_y U_i^{p_i+1}\rangle K_i\\
&= -n\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} K_i U_i^{p_i+1} - \int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} \langle y-y_i, \nabla_y K_i\rangle U_i^{p_i+1} + \int_{\partial B_1(y_i)} K_i U_i^{p_i+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two, together with Proposition 4.3, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_i\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} U_i^{p_i+1} \le& C(n,\sigma,A_1,A_2)\Big\{\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} |y-y_i| U_i^{p_i+1}\\
&+ \int_{\partial B_1(y_i)} U_i^{p_i+1} + \int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)} t^{1-2\sigma}|B''(Y, U_i, \nabla U_i, 1, \sigma)|\Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Since $U_i = u_i$ on $\partial'\mathcal{B}_1(Y_i) = B_1(y_i) \times \{0\}$, it follows from Proposition 4.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1(Y_i)} U_i^{p_i+1} &= \int_{B_1(y_i)} u_i^{p_i+1} \\ &\geq C^{-1} \int_{B_1(y_i)} \frac{m_i^{p_i+1}}{(1+|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(y-y_i)|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)(p_i+1)/2}} \\ &\geq C^{-1} m_i^{\tau_i(n/2\sigma-1)} \int_{B_{m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}}} \frac{1}{(1+|z|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)(p_i+1)/2}} \\ &\geq C^{-1} m_i^{\tau_i(n/2\sigma-1)},\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where we used change of variables $z = m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(y-y_i)$ in the second inequality.

By Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 4.2, it is easy to see that the last two integral terms of right-handed side of (4.14) are in $O(m_i^{-2+o(1)})$. By Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_{r_i}(Y_i)} |Y-Y_i| U_i^{p_i+1} &= \int_{B_{r_i}(y_i)} |y-y_i| u_i^{p_i+1} \\ &\leq C \int_{B_{r_i}(y_i)} \frac{|y-y_i| m_i^{p_i+1}}{(1+|m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(y-y_i)|^2)^{(n-2\sigma)(p_i+1)/2}} \\ &\leq C m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)+o(1)} \int_{B_{R_i}} \frac{|z|}{(1+|z|^2)^{n+o(1)}} \\ &\leq C m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)+o(1)}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

By Lemma 4.2 and that $R_i \to \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1(Y_i)\setminus\partial'\mathcal{B}_{r_i}(Y_i)} |Y-Y_i| U_i^{p_i+1} &= \int_{B_1(y_i)\setminus B_{r_i}(y_i)} |y-y_i| u_i^{p_i+1} \\ &\leq m_i^{-\lambda_i(p_i+1)} r_i^{n+1+(2\sigma-n+\delta_i)(p_i+1)} \\ &= o(m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)+o(1)}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Combining (4.14), (4.15), (4.16), (4.17) and that $\tau_i = o(1)$, we complete the proof. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *Under the assumptions in Lemma 4.2, we have*

$$u_i(y) \leq C u_i^{-1}(y_i)|y-y_i|^{2\sigma-n}, \quad \text{for all } |y-y_i| \leq 1.$$

Our proof of this Proposition makes use of the following

Lemma 4.4. *Let $n \geq 2$. Suppose that for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, $U \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^+})$ and $U > 0$ in $\mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^+}$ be a weak solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U) = 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_1^+ \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^+}, \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) = 0, & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \overline{B_\varepsilon^+}. \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

Then

$$U(X) = A|X|^{2\sigma-n} + H(X),$$

where A is a nonnegative constant and $H(X) \in H(t^{1-2\sigma}, \mathcal{B}_1^+)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla H) = 0 & \textit{in } \mathcal{B}_1^+, \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t H(x,t) = 0, & \textit{in } B_1. \end{cases} \tag{4.19}$$

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is provided in Appendix A.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. For $|y - y_i| < r_i$, it follows from Proposition 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(y) &\leq Cm_i \left(\frac{1}{1 + |m_i^{(p_i-1)/2\sigma}(y - y_i)|^2} \right)^{(n-2\sigma)/2} \\ &\leq Cm_i^{-1-\frac{n-2\sigma}{2\sigma}\tau_i}|y - y_i|^{2\sigma-n} \\ &\leq Cm_i^{-1}|y - y_i|^{2\sigma-n}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

where Lemma 4.3 is used the last inequality.

Suppose $|y - y_i| \geq r_i$. Let $e \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+^{n+1}$ with $|e| = 1$, and set $V_i(Y) = U_i(Y_i + e)^{-1}U_i(Y)$. Then V_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla V_i) = 0, & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_2^+, \\ -\lim\limits_{s\to 0} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s V_i(y,s) = c(n,\sigma)KU_i(Y_i + e)^{p_i-1}V_i^{p_i}, & \text{for } y \in B_2^+. \end{cases}$$

Note that $U_i(Y_i + e) \to 0$ by Lemma 4.2, and for any $r > 0$

$$V_i(Y) \leq C(n, \sigma, A_1, r), \quad \text{for all } r < |y - y_i| \leq 1 \tag{4.21}$$

which follows from Lemma 4.1. It follows that $\{V_i\}$ converges to some positive function V in $C^\infty_{loc}(\mathcal{B}^+_{3/2}) \cap C^\alpha_{loc}(\overline{\mathcal{B}}^+_{3/2} \setminus \{0\})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and V satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla V) = 0, & \text{in } \mathcal{B}_1^+ \\ -\lim\limits_{s\to 0} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s V(y,s) = 0 & \text{for } y \in B_1^+ \setminus \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

Hence $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} r^{2\sigma/(p_i+1)}\bar{v}_i(r) = r^{n-2\sigma}\bar{v}(r)$, where $v(y) = V(y, 0)$. Since $r_i \to 0$ and $y_i \to 0$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$, it follows from Lemma 4.1 that $r^{(n-2\sigma)/2}\overline{V}(r)$ is *almost decreasing* for all $0 < r < \rho$, i.e., there exists a positive constant C (which comes from Harnack inequality in Lemma 4.1) such that for any $0 < r_1 \leq r_2 < \rho$,

$$r_1^{(n-2\sigma)/2}\overline{V}(r_1) \geq Cr_2^{(n-2\sigma)/2}\overline{V}(r_2).$$

Therefore, V has to have a singularity at $Y = 0$. Lemma 4.4 implies

$$V(Y) = A|Y|^{2\sigma-n} + H(Y), \tag{4.22}$$

where $A>0$ is a constant and H is as in Lemma 4.4.

We first establish the inequality in Proposition 4.4 for $|Y-Y_i|=1$. Namely, we prove that

$$U_i(Y_i+e)\leq CU_i^{-1}(Y_i) \tag{4.23}$$

Suppose that (4.23) does not hold, then along a subsequence we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}U_i(Y_i+e)U_i(Y_i)=\infty. \tag{4.24}$$

By integration by parts (using Ω_ε and sending $\varepsilon\to 0$, as in the proof of Proposition 4.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0&=-\int_{\mathcal{B}_1^+}\mathrm{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla V_i)\\&=\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_1^+}s^{1-2\sigma}\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial\nu}+c(n,\sigma)U_i(Y_i+e)^{-1}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+}KU_i^{p_i}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

By Lemma 4.3 and similar computation in (4.16) and (4.17), we see that

$$\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+}KU_i^{p_i}\leq CU_i(Y_i)^{-1}.$$

Due to (4.24),

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}U_i(Y_i+e)^{-1}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+}KU_i^{p_i}=0.$$

A direct computation yields with (4.21) (again using Ω_ε and sending $\varepsilon\to 0$)

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_1^+}s^{1-2\sigma}\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial\nu}&=\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_1^+}s^{1-2\sigma}\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}(A|Y|^{2\sigma-n}+H(Y))\\&=A(2\sigma-n)\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_1^+}s^{1-2\sigma}<0,\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts to (4.25). Thus we proved (4.23). By Lemma 4.1, we have established the inequality in Proposition 4.4 for $\rho\leq|Y-Y_i|\leq 1$.

By a standard scaling argument, we can reduce the case of $r_i\leq|Y-Y_i|<\rho$ to $|Y-Y_i|=1$. We refer to [68] (page 340) for details. □

Proposition 4.2 and 4.4 give a clear picture of u_i near the isolated simple blow up point. By the estimates there, it is easy to see the following result.

Lemma 4.5. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{|y-y_i|\leq r_i}|y-y_i|^s u_i(y)^{p_i+1}\\&\qquad=\begin{cases}O(u_i(y_i)^{-2s/(n-2\sigma)}), & -n<s<n,\\ O(u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\log u_i(y_i)), & s=n,\\ o(u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}), & s>n,\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{r_i<|y-y_i|\le 1}|y-y_i|^s u_i(y)^{p_i+1}$$
$$=\begin{cases} o(u_i(y_i)^{-2s/(n-2\sigma)}), & -n<s<n,\\ O(u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\log u_i(y_i)), & s=n,\\ O(u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}), & s>n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The first estimate in the above Lemma follows from Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.3, and the second one follows from Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 4.3. ☐

For later application, we replace K_i by $K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i}$ in (4.2) and consider

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u_i(x)=c(n,\sigma)K_i(x)H_i(x)^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i}(x),\quad \text{in } B_2, \tag{4.26}$$

where $\{H_i\}\in C^{1,1}(B_2)$ satisfies

$$A_4^{-1}\le H_i(y)\le A_4,\quad \text{for all } y\in B_2,\quad \text{and}\quad \|H_i\|_{C^{1,1}(B_2)}\le A_5 \tag{4.27}$$

for some positive constants A_4 and A_5.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that $\{K_i\}$ satisfies* (4.1) *and $(*)_\beta$ condition with $\beta<n$ for some positive constants A_1, A_2, $\{L(\beta,i)\}$, and that $\{H_i\}$ satisfies* (4.27) *with A_4, A_5. Let $u_i\in\dot H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap C^2(B_2)$ and $u_i\ge 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ be a solution of* (4.26)*. If $y_i\to 0$ is an isolated simple blow up point of $\{u_i\}$ with* (4.5) *for some positive constant A_3, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i\le & Cu_i(y_i)^{-2}+C|\nabla K_i(y_i)|u_i(y_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}\\ &+C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})u_i(y_i)^{-2\beta/(n-2\sigma)},\end{aligned}$$

where $C>0$ depends only on $n,\sigma,A_1,A_2,A_3,A_4,A_5,\beta$ and ρ.

Proof. Using Lemma 4.3 and arguing the same as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i &\le Cu_i(y_i)^{-2}+C\left|\int_{B_1(y_i)}\langle y-y_i,\nabla_y(K_iH_i^{\tau_i})\rangle u_i^{p_i+1}\right|\\ &\le Cu_i(y_i)^{-2}+C\tau_i\left|\int_{B_1(y_i)}|y-y_i|u_i^{p_i+1}\right|\\ &\quad +C\left|\int_{B_1(y_i)}\langle y-y_i,\nabla K_i\rangle H_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\right|.\end{aligned}$$

Making use of Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{B_1(y_i)} \langle y-y_i, \nabla K_i\rangle H_i^{\tau_i} u_i^{p_i+1}\right|\\
&\le C|\nabla K_i(y_i)|\int_{B_1(y_i)} |y-y_i| u_i^{p_i+1}\\
&\quad + C\int_{B_1(y_i)} |y-y_i||\nabla K_i(y)-\nabla K_i(y_i)| u_i^{p_i+1}\\
&\le C|\nabla K_i(y_i)| u_i(y_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}\\
&\quad + C\int_{B_1(y_i)} |y-y_i||\nabla K_i(y)-\nabla K_i(y_i)| u_i^{p_i+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of $(*)_\beta$, a directly computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla K_i(y)-\nabla K_i(y_i)|\\
&\le \Big\{\sum_{s=2}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s K_i(y_i)||y-y_i|^{s-1} + [\nabla^{[\beta]}K_i]_{C^{\beta-[\beta]}(B_1(y_i))}|y-y_i|^{\beta-1}\Big\}\\
&\le CL(\beta,i)\Big\{\sum_{s=2}^{[\beta]} |\nabla K_i(y_i)|^{(\beta-s)/(\beta-1)}|y-y_i|^{s-1} + |y-y_i|^{\beta-1}\Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&L(\beta,i)|\nabla K_i(y_i)|^{(\beta-s)/(\beta-1)}|y-y_i|^s\\
&\le C(|\nabla K_i(y_i)||y-y_i| + (L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})|y-y_i|^\beta).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.5 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_1(y_i)} |y-y_i||\nabla K_i(y)-\nabla K_i(y_i)| u_i^{p_i+1}\\
&\le C|\nabla K_i(y_i)| u_i(y_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)} + C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1}) u_i(y_i)^{-2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

Lemma 4.6 follows immediately. □

Lemma 4.7. *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 4.6,*

$$|\nabla K_i(y_i)| \le Cu_i(y_i)^{-2} + C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1}) u_i(y_i)^{-2(\beta-1)/(n-2\sigma)},$$

where $C>0$ *depends only on* $n,\sigma,A_1,A_2,A_3,A_4,A_5,\beta$ *and* ρ.

Proof. Choose a cutoff function $\eta(Y)\in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{B}_{1/2})$ satisfying

$$\eta(Y)=1,\quad |Y|\le\frac{1}{4} \text{ and } \eta(Y)=0,\quad |Y|\ge\frac{1}{2}.$$

Let $U_i(Y)$ be the extension of $u_i(y)$, namely,

$$\begin{cases}\operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U_i)=0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+\\ -\lim\limits_{s\to 0} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s U(y,s)=c_0K_i(y)H_i^{\tau_i}U_i^{p_i}, & y\in B_2.\end{cases} \tag{4.31}$$

Multiplying (4.31) by $\eta(Y-Y_i)\partial y_j U_i(y,s)$, $j=1,\cdots,n$, and integrating by parts over $\mathcal{B}_1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\int_{\mathcal{B}_1^+}\operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U_i)\eta\partial_{y_j}U_i\\ &=-\int_{\mathcal{B}_1^+}s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U_i\nabla(\eta\partial_{y_j}U_i)+c_0\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+(Y_i)}\eta K_iH_i^{\tau_i}\partial_{y_j}U_iU_i^{p_i}\\ &=\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{B}_{1/2}^+\setminus\mathcal{B}_{1/4}^+}s^{1-2\sigma}(|\nabla U_i|^2\partial_{y_j}\eta-2\nabla U_i\nabla\eta\partial_{y_j}U_i)\\ &\quad-\frac{c_0}{p_i+1}\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_1^+}\partial_{y_j}(K_iH_i^{\tau_i}\eta)U_i^{p_i+1}.\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.4, we have

$$U_i(Y)\le CU_i(Y_i)^{-1},\quad \text{for all } 1/2\ge|Y|\ge 1/4$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}_{1/2}^+\setminus\mathcal{B}_{1/4}^+}s^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U_i|^2\le CU_i(Y_i)^{-2}.$$

Therefore by Lemma 4.5 we conclude that

$$\left|\int_{B_1}\partial_{y_j}K_iH_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\right|\le Cu_i(y_i)^{-2}+C\tau_i. \tag{4.32}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\partial_jK_i(y_i)\int_{B_1}H_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\right|-Cu_i(y_i)^{-2}-C\tau_i\\ &\quad\le\int_{B_1}|\partial_jK_i(y_i)-\partial_jK_i(y)|H_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\end{aligned}$$

Summing over j, then making use of (4.28), (4.29) and Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla K_i(y_i)|&\le Cu_i(y_i)^{-2}+C\tau_i+\frac{1}{2}|\nabla K_i(y_i)|\\ &\qquad+C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})u_i(y_i)^{-2(\beta-1)/(n-2\sigma)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then Lemma 4.7 follows from Lemma 4.6. □

Lemma 4.8. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 we have*

$$\tau_i\le Cu_i(y_i)^{-2}+C(L(\beta,i)+L(\beta,i)^{\beta-1})u_i(y_i)^{-2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}.$$

Proof. It follows immediately from Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7. $\square$

Corollary 4.1. *In addition to the assumptions of Lemma 4.6, we further assume that one of the following two conditions holds: (i)*

$$\beta = n - 2\sigma \text{ and } L(\beta, i) = o(1),$$

and (ii)

$$\beta > n - 2\sigma \text{ and } L(\beta, i) = O(1).$$

Then for any $0 < \delta < 1$ *we have*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(y_i)^2 \int_{B_\delta(y_i)} (y - y_i) \cdot \nabla(K_i H_i^{\tau_i}) u_i^{p_i+1} = 0.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{B_\delta(y_i)} (y - y_i) \cdot \nabla(K_i H_i^{\tau_i}) u_i^{p_i+1} \right| \\
&\le \left| \int_{B_\delta(y_i)} (y - y_i) \cdot \nabla K_i H_i^{\tau_i} u_i^{p_i+1} \right| + \tau_i \left| \int_{B_\delta(y_i)} (y - y_i) \cdot \nabla H_i H_i^{\tau_i - 1} K_i u_i^{p_i+1} \right| \\
&\le C |\nabla K_i(y_i)| \int_{B_\delta(y_i)} |y - y_i| u_i^{p_i+1} \\
&\quad + C \int_{B_\delta(y_i)} |y - y_i| |\nabla K_i(y) - \nabla K_i(y_i)| u_i^{p_i+1} + \tau_i \int_{B_\delta(y_i)} |y - y_i| u_i^{p_i+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The corollary follows immediately from Lemma 4.7, (4.30) and Lemma 4.8. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that* $\{K_i\}$ *satisfies* (4.1) *and* $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ *condition for some positive constants* A_1, A_2, L *independent of* i*, and that* $\{H_i\}$ *satisfies* (4.27) *with* A_4, A_5*. Let* $u_i \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^2(B_2)$ *be a solution of* (4.26)*. If* $y_i \to 0$ *is an isolated blow up point of* $\{u_i\}$ *with* (4.5) *for some positive constant* A_3*, then* $y_i \to 0$ *is an isolated simple blow up point.*

Proof. Due to Proposition 4.1, $r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r)$ has precisely one critical point in the interval $0 < r < r_i$, where $r_i = R_i u_i(y_i)^{-\frac{p_i-1}{2\sigma}}$ as before. Suppose $y_i \to 0$ is not an isolated simple blow up point and let μ_i be the second critical point of $r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{u}_i(r)$. Then we see that

$$\mu_i \ge r_i, \quad \lim_{i\to\infty} \mu_i = 0. \tag{4.33}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $y_i = 0$. Set

$$\phi_i(y) = \mu_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(\mu_i y), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Clearly, ϕ_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
(-\Delta)^\sigma \phi_i(y) &= \tilde{K}_i(y) \tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}(y) \phi_i^{p_i}(y), \\
|y|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \phi_i(y) &\le A_3, \quad |y| < 1/\mu_i, \\
\lim_{i\to\infty} \phi_i(0) &= \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

$$r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{\phi}_i(r) \text{ has precisely one critical point in } 0 < r < 1,$$

and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left\{r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{\phi}_i(r)\right\}\Big|_{r=1} = 0,$$

where $\tilde{K}_i(y) = K_i(\mu_i y)$, $\tilde{H}_i(y) = H_i(\mu_i y)$ and $\overline{\phi}_i(r) = |\partial B_r|^{-1}\int_{\partial B_r}\phi_i$.

Therefore, 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of ϕ_i. Let $\Phi_i(Y)$ be the extension of $\phi_i(y)$ in the upper half space. Then Lemma 4.1, Proposition 4.4, Lemma 4.4 and elliptic equation theory together imply that

$$\Phi_i(0)\Phi_i(Y) \to G(Y) = A|Y|^{2\sigma-n} + H(Y) \quad \text{in } C^\alpha_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+}\setminus\{0\}) \cap C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+).$$

and

$$\phi_i(0)\phi_i(y) \to G(y,0) = A|y|^{2\sigma-n} + H(y,0) \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{0\}) \tag{4.34}$$

as $i \to \infty$, where $A > 0$, $H(Y)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases}\mathrm{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla H) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+\\ -\lim\limits_{s\to 0} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s H(y,s) = 0 & \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^n.\end{cases}$$

Note that $G(Y)$ is nonnegative, we have $\liminf_{|Y|\to\infty} H(Y) \geq 0$. It follows from the weak maximum principle and the Harnack inequality that $H(y) \equiv H \geq 0$ is a constant. Since

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left\{r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\phi_i(0)\overline{\phi}_i(r)\right\}\Big|_{r=1} = \phi_i(0)\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left\{r^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)}\overline{\phi}_i(r)\right\}\Big|_{r=1} = 0,$$

we have, by sending i to ∞ and making use of (4.34), that

$$A = H > 0.$$

We are going to derive a contradiction to the Pohozaev identity Proposition 4.3, by showing that for small positive δ

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}\Phi_i(0)^2\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}^+_\delta} B'(Y,\Phi_i,\nabla\Phi_i,\delta,\sigma) \leq 0, \tag{4.35}$$

and

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}\Phi_i(0)^2\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}^+_\delta} s^{1-2\sigma}B''(Y,\Phi_i,\nabla\Phi_i,\delta,\sigma) < 0. \tag{4.36}$$

And thus Proposition 4.5 will be established.

By Proposition 2.6, it is easy to verify (4.36) by that

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{i\to\infty}\Phi_i(0)^2\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}^+_\delta} s^{1-2\sigma}B''(Y,\Phi_i,\nabla\Phi_i,\delta,\sigma)\\ &\quad= \int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}^+_\delta} s^{1-2\sigma}B''(Y,G,\nabla G,\delta,\sigma) = -\frac{(n-2\sigma)^2}{2}A^2\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}^+_1} t^{1-2\sigma} < 0,\end{aligned}$$

which shows (4.36). On the other hand, via integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_\delta^+} B'(Y,\Phi_i,\nabla\Phi_i,\delta,\sigma)\\
&=\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}\int_{B_\delta}\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\phi_i^{p_i+1}+\int_{B_\delta}\langle y,\nabla\phi_i\rangle\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\phi_i^{p_i}\\
&=\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}\int_{B_\delta}\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\phi_i^{p_i+1}-\frac{n}{p_i+1}\int_{B_\delta}\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\phi_i^{p_i+1}\\
&\quad-\frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{B_\delta}\langle y,\nabla(\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i})\rangle\phi_i^{p_i+1}+\frac{\delta}{p_i+1}\int_{\partial B_\delta}\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}\phi_i^{p_i+1}\\
&\le-\frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{B_\delta}\langle y,\nabla(\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i})\rangle\phi_i^{p_i+1}+C\phi_i(0)^{-(p_i+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

where Proposition 4.4 is used in the last inequality. It is easy to see that $\{\tilde{K}_i\}$ satisfies $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ with $L(\beta,i)=o(1)$. Therefore, (4.35) follows from Corollary 4.1. $\square$

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose the assumptions in Proposition 4.5 except the $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ condition for K_i. Then*

$$|\nabla K_i(y_i)|\to 0,\quad \textit{as } i\to\infty.$$

Proof. Suppose that contrary that

$$|\nabla K_i(y_i)|\to d>0. \tag{4.37}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $y_i=0$. There are two cases.

Case 1. 0 is an isolated simple blow up point.

In this case, we argue as in the proof of Lemma 4.7 and obtain

$$\left|\int_{B_1}\nabla K_i H_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}\right|\le Cu_i^{-2}(0)+C\tau_i.$$

It follows from the mean value theorem, Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5 that

$$|\nabla K_i(0)|\le C\int_{B_1}|\nabla K_i(y)-\nabla K_i(0)|H_i^{\tau_i}u_i^{p_i+1}+o(1)=o(1).$$

Case 2. 0 is not an isolated simple blow up point.

In this case we argue as the proof of Proposition 4.5. The only difference is that we cannot derive (4.35) from Corollary 4.1, since $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ condition for K_i is not assumed. Instead, we will use the condition (4.37) to show (4.35).

Let μ_i,ϕ_i,Φ_i, $\tilde{K}_i$ and $\tilde{H}_i$ be as in the proof of Proposition 4.5. The computation at the end of the proof of Proposition 4.5 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial'\mathcal{B}_\delta^+} B'(Y,\Phi_i,\nabla\Phi_i,\delta,\sigma)\\
&\le-\frac{1}{p_i+1}\int_{B_\delta}\langle y,\nabla(\tilde{K}_i\tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i})\rangle\phi_i^{p_i+1}+C\phi_i(0)^{-(p_i+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate the integral term $\int_{B_\delta}\langle y,\nabla(\tilde K_i\tilde H_i^{\tau_i})\rangle\phi_i^{p_i+1}$. Using Lemma 4.3 and arguing the same as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i &\le C\phi_i(0)^{-2}+C\int_{B_\delta}|y||\nabla\tilde K_i(y)|H_i^{\tau_i}\phi_i^{p_i+1}\\ &\le C\phi_i(0)^{-2}+C\mu_i\phi_i(0)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}.\end{aligned}$$

By (4.32),

$$\left|\int_{B_\delta}\nabla\tilde K_i\tilde H_i^{\tau_i}\phi_i^{p_i+1}\right|\le C\phi_i(y_i)^{-2}+C\tau_i.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla\tilde K_i(0)| &\le C\int_{B_\delta}|\nabla\tilde K_i(y)-\nabla\tilde K_i(0)|\phi_i^{p_i+1}+C\phi_i(0)^{-2}+C\tau_i\\ &\le C\mu_i\phi_i(0)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}+C\phi_i(0)^{-2}+C\tau_i.\end{aligned}$$

Since $|\nabla\tilde K_i(0)|=\mu_i|\nabla K_i(0)|\ge(d/2)\mu_i$, we have

$$\mu_i\le C\phi_i(0)^{-2}+C\tau_i.$$

It follows that

$$\tau_i\le C\phi_i(0)^{-2}\quad\text{and}\quad\mu_i\le C\phi_i(0)^{-2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\left|\int_{B_\delta}\langle y,\nabla(\tilde K_i\tilde H_i^{\tau_i})\rangle\phi_i^{p_i+1}\right|\le C\phi_i(0)^{-2-2/(n-2\sigma)}$$

and (4.35) follows immediately.

□

5 Estimates on the sphere and proofs of main theorems

Consider

$$P_\sigma(v)=c(n,\sigma)Kv^p,\quad\text{on }\mathbb{S}^n,\tag{5.1}$$

where $p\in(1,\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}]$ and K satisfies

$$A_1^{-1}\le K\le A_1,\quad\text{on }\mathbb{S}^n,\tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\|K\|_{C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)}\le A_2.\tag{5.3}$$

Proposition 5.1. *Let* $v\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *be a positive solution to* (5.1). *For any* $0<\varepsilon<1$ *and* $R>1$, *there exist large positive constants* C_1, C_2 *depending on* $n,\sigma,A_1,A_2,\varepsilon$ *and* R *such that, if*

$$\max_{\mathbb{S}^n}v\ge C_1,$$

then $\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma} - p < \varepsilon$*, and there exists a finite set* $\wp(v) \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ *such that*
(i). If $P \in \wp(v)$*, then it is a local maximum of* v *and in the stereographic projection coordinate system* $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$ *with* P *as the south pole,*

$$\|v^{-1}(P)v(v^{-\frac{(p-1)}{2\sigma}}(P)y) - (1+k|y|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}\|_{C^2(B_{2R})} \le \varepsilon, \tag{5.4}$$

where $k = K(P)^{1/\sigma}/4$*.*
(ii). If P_1, P_2 *belonging to* $\wp(v)$ *are two different points, then*

$$B_{Rv(P_1)^{-(p-1)/2\sigma}}(P_1) \cap B_{Rv(P_2)^{-(p-1)/2\sigma}}(P_2) = \emptyset.$$

(iii). $v(P) \le C_2\{dist(P, \wp(v))\}^{-2\sigma/(p-1)}$ *for all* $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$*.*

Proof. Given Theorem 1.5, Remark 1.2 and the proof of Proposition 4.1, the proof of Proposition 5.1 is similar to that of Proposition 4.1 in [68] and Lemma 3.1 in [88], and is omitted here. We refer to [68] and [88] for details. ☐

Proposition 5.2. *Assume the hypotheses in Proposition 5.1. Suppose that there exists some constant* $d > 0$ *such that* K *satisfies* $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ *for some* L *in* $\Omega_d = \{P \in \mathbb{S}^n : |\nabla K(P)| < d\}$*. Then, for* $\varepsilon > 0$*,* $R > 1$ *and any solution* v *of* (5.1) *with* $\max_{\mathbb{S}^n} v > C_1$*, we have*

$$|P_1 - P_2| \ge \delta^* > 0, \quad \textit{for any } P_1, P_2 \in \wp(v) \textit{ and } P_1 \ne P_2,$$

where δ^* *depends only on* $n, \sigma, \delta, \varepsilon, R, A_1, A_2, L_2, d$*.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary, then there exists sequences of $\{p_i\}$ and $\{K_i\}$ satisfying the above assumptions, and a sequence of corresponding solutions $\{v_i\}$ such that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} |P_{1i} - P_{2i}| = 0, \tag{5.5}$$

where $P_{1i}, P_{2i} \in \wp(v_i)$, and $|P_{1i} - P_{2i}| = \min_{\substack{P_1,P_2\in\wp(v_i)\\ P_1\ne P_2}} |P_1 - P_2|$.

Since $B_{Rv_i(P_{1i})^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}}(P_{1i})$ and $B_{Rv_i(P_{2i})^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}}(P_{2i})$ have to be disjoint, we have, because of (5.5), that $v_i(P_{1i}) \to \infty$ and $v_i(P_{2i}) \to \infty$. Therefore, we can pass to a subsequence (still denoted as v_i) with $R_i \to \infty$, $\varepsilon_i \to 0$ as in Proposition 4.1 (ε_i depends on R_i and can be chosen as small as we need in the following arguments) such that, for y being the stereographic projection coordinate with south pole at $P_{ji},\ j = 1, 2$, we have

$$\|m_i^{-1} v_i(m_i^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma} y) - (1 + k_{ji}|y|^2)^{(2\sigma-n)/2}\|_{C^2(B_{2R_i}(0))} \le \varepsilon_i, \tag{5.6}$$

where $m_i = v_i(0)$, $k_{ji} = K_i(q_{ji})^{1/\sigma}$, $j = 1, 2; i = 1, 2, \cdots$

In the stereographic coordinates with P_{1i} being the south pole, the equation (5.1) is transformed into

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u_i(y) = c(n,\sigma)K_i(y)H_i^{\tau_i}(y)u_i^{p_i}(y), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(y) &= \left(\frac{2}{1+|y|^2}\right)^{(n-2\sigma)/2} v_i(F(y)), \\ H_i(y) &= \left(\frac{2}{1+|y|^2}\right)^{(n-2\sigma)/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

and F is the inverse of the stereographic projection. Let us still use $P_{2i} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to denote the stereographic coordinates of $P_{2i} \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and set $\vartheta_i = |P_{2i}| \to 0$. For simplicity, we assume P_{2i} is a local maximum point of u_i. Since we can always reselect a sequence of points as in the proof of Proposition 5.1 to substitute for P_{2i}.

From (ii) in Proposition 5.1, there exists some constant C depending only on n, σ, such that

$$\vartheta_i > \frac{1}{C} \max\{R_i u_i(0)^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}, R_i u_i(P_{2i})^{-(p_i-1)/2\sigma}\}. \tag{5.9}$$

Set

$$w_i(y) = \vartheta_i^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} u_i(\vartheta_i y), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is easy to see that w_i which is positive in $\mathbb{R}^n$, satisfies

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma w_i(y) = c(n,\sigma) \tilde{K}_i(y) \tilde{H}_i^{\tau_i}(y) w_i(y)^{p_i}, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$w_i(y) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \liminf_{|y|\to\infty} w_i(y) < \infty,$$

where $\tilde{K}_i(y) = K_i(\vartheta_i y)$, $\tilde{H}_i(y) = H_i(\vartheta_i y)$.

By Proposition 5.1, u_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(y) &\le C_2 |y|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \text{for all } |y| \le \vartheta_i/2 \\ u_i(y) &\le C_2 |y - P_{2i}|^{-2\sigma/(p_i-1)} \quad \text{for all } |y - P_{2i}| \le \vartheta_i/2. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (5.9), we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i\to\infty} w_i(0) = \infty, \quad \lim_{i\to\infty} w_i(|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}) &= \infty \\ |y|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} w_i(y) \le C_2, \quad |y| &\le 1/2, \\ |y - |P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}|^{2\sigma/(p_i-1)} w_i(y) \le C_2, \quad |y - |P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i}| &\le 1/2. \end{aligned}$$

After passing a subsequence, if necessary, there exists a point $\overline{P} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\overline{P}| = 1$ such that $|P_{2i}|^{-1}P_{2i} \to \overline{P}$ as $i \to \infty$. Hence 0 and $\overline{P}$ are both isolated blow up points of w_i.

If $|\nabla K_i(0)| \le d/2$, then 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of w_i because of the $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ condition and Proposition 4.5. If $|\nabla K_i(0)| \ge d/2$, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.6 we can conclude that 0 is an isolated simple blow up point of w_i. Similarly, $\overline{P}$ is also an isolated simple blow up point of w_i.

By Proposition 4.4,

$$w_i(0) w_i(y) \le C_\varepsilon, \text{for all } \varepsilon \le |y| \le 1/2,$$

where C_ε is independent of i. Let W_i be the extension of w_i. Due to Proposition 5.1, Harnack inequality Lemma 4.1, and the choice of P_{1i}, P_{2i}, there exists an at most countable set $\wp \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\inf\{|x-y| : x, y \in \wp,\ x \ne y\} \ge 1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i\to\infty} W_i(0) W_i(Y) = G(Y), \quad &\text{in } C^0_{loc}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \setminus \wp) \\ G(Y) > 0, \quad &Y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \setminus \wp. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\wp_1 \subset \wp$ contain those points near which G is singular. Clearly, $0, \overline{P} \in \wp_1$. Since $p_i > 1$, it follows from (5.10) that

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla G) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ -\lim\limits_{s\to 0} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s G(y,s) = 0, & \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \wp_1. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 4.4 and maximum principle, there exist positive constants N_1, N_2 and some nonnegative function H satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(s^{1-2\sigma}\nabla H) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \\ -\lim\limits_{s\to 0} s^{1-2\sigma}\partial_s H(y,s) = 0, & \text{for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\wp_1 \setminus \{0, \overline{P}\}\} \end{cases}$$

such that

$$G(Y) = N_1|Y|^{2\sigma-n} + N_2|Y-\overline{P}|^{2\sigma-n} + H(Y), \quad Y \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \setminus \{\wp_1\}.$$

Applying Proposition 2.6 to H, it is not difficult to verify (4.36) with Φ_i replaced by W_i. On the other hand, we can establish (4.35) with Φ_i replaced by W_i if $|\nabla K_i(0)| \leq d/2$, because $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ condition with $L = o(1)$ holds for $\tilde{K}_i$ and thus Corollary 4.1 holds. If $|\nabla K_i(0)| \geq d/2$, we can apply the argument in the proof of Proposition 4.6 to conclude that $\vartheta_i, \tau_i \leq w_i(0)^{-2}$, and hence (4.35) also holds for W_i.

Proposition 5.2 is established. ☐

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} P_\sigma(v) = c(n,\sigma)K_i v_i^{p_i} \quad & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n, \\ v_i > 0, \quad & \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n, \\ p_i = \frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma} - \tau_i, \quad & \tau_i \geq 0, \tau_i \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose K_i satisfies the assumption of K in Proposition 5.2. Let v_i be solutions of* (5.11)*, we have*

$$\|v_i\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{S}^n)} \leq C, \tag{5.12}$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, L, d$. Furthermore, after passing to a subsequence, either $\{v_i\}$ stays bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ or $\{v_i\}$ has only isolated simple blow up points and the distance between any two blow up points is bounded blow by some positive constant depending only on $n, \sigma, A_1, A_2, L, d$.

Proof. The theorem follows immediately from Proposition 5.2, Proposition 4.6, Proposition 4.5, Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.5. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.3. It follows immediately from Theorem 5.1. ☐

In the next theorem, we impose a stronger condition on K_i such that $\{u_i\}$ has at most one blow up point.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose the assumptions in Theorem 5.1. Suppose further that* $\{K_i\}$ *satisfies* $(*)_{n-2\sigma}$ *condition for some sequences* $L(n-2\sigma,i)=o(1)$ *in* $\Omega_{d,i}=\{q\in\mathbb{S}^n:|\nabla_{g_0}K_i|<d\}$ *or* $\{K_i\}$ *satisfies* $(*)_\beta$ *condition with* $\beta>n-2\sigma$ *in* $\Omega_{d,i}$. *Then, after passing to a subsequence, either* $\{v_i\}$ *stays bounded in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *or* $\{v_i\}$ *has precisely one isolated simple blow up point.*

Proof. The strategy is the same as the proof of Proposition 5.2. We assume there are two isolated blow up points. After some transformation, we can assume that they are in the same half sphere. The condition of $\{K_i\}$ guarantees that Corollary 4.1 holds for u_i, where u_i is as in (5.8). Hence (4.35) holds for U_i, which is the extension of u_i. Meanwhile (4.36) for U_i is also valid, since the distance between these blow up points is uniformly lower bounded which is due to Proposition 5.2. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Theorem 5.2, we only need to show the latter case of theorem. After passing a subsequence, $\xi_i\to\overline{\xi}$ is the only isolated simple blow up point of v_i. For simplicity, assume that ξ_i is identical to the south pole and $K(\xi_i)=1$. Let $F:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{S}^n$ be the inverse of stereographic projection defined at the beginning of the paper. Define, for any $\lambda>0$,

$$\psi_\lambda: x\mapsto \lambda x,\quad \forall x\in\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Set $\varphi_i=F\circ\psi_{\lambda_i}\circ F^{-1}$ with $\lambda_i=v_i(\xi_i)^{-\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}$. Then $T_{\varphi_i}v_i$ satisfies

$$P_\sigma(T_{\varphi_i}v_i)=c(n,\sigma)K\circ\varphi_i T_{\varphi_i}v_i^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}},\quad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n.$$

Let

$$u_i(x)=\Big(\frac{2}{1+|x|^2}\Big)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}v_i\circ F(x),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^n$$

and

$$\tilde{u}_i(x)=\Big(\frac{2}{1+|x|^2}\Big)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}T_{\varphi_i}v_i\circ F(x),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Note that

$$|\det \mathrm{d}\varphi_i(F(x))|^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}}=\Big(\Big(\frac{2}{1+|\lambda_i x|^2}\Big)^n\lambda_i^n\Big(\frac{2}{1+|x|^2}\Big)^{-n}\Big)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}}.$$

Hence, $\tilde{u}_i(x)=\lambda^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}u_i(\lambda_i x)$ for any $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and $0<u_i\le 2^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}}$. Arguing as before, we see that

$$\tilde{u}_i(x)\to\Big(\frac{2}{1+|x|^2}\Big)^{\frac{n-2\sigma}{2}},\quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Therefore, $v_i\to 1$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{S}^n\setminus\{N\})$, where N is the north pole of $\mathbb{S}^n$.

Since $T_{\varphi_i}v_i$ is uniformly bounded near the north pole, it follows from Hölder estimates that there exists a constant $\alpha\in(0,1)$ such that $T_{\varphi_i}v_i\to f$ in $C^\alpha(B_\delta(N))$ for small constant $\delta>0$ and some function $f\in C^\alpha(B_\delta(N))$. It is clear that $f=1$. Therefore, we complete the proof. ☐

Theorem 5.3. *Let* v_i *be positive solutions of* (5.11). *Suppose that* $\{K_i\}\subset C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^n)$ *satisfies* (5.3), *and for some point* $P_0\in\mathbb{S}^n$, $\varepsilon_0>0$, $A_1>0$ *independent of* i *and* $1<\beta<n$, *that*

$$\{K_i\}\ \textit{is bounded in}\ C^{[\beta],\beta-[\beta]}(B_{\varepsilon_0}(q_0)),\qquad K_i(P_0)\ge A_1$$

and

$$K_i(y) = K_i(0) + Q_i^{(\beta)}(y) + R_i(y), \quad |y| \le \varepsilon_0,$$

where y *is the stereographic projection coordinate with* P_0 *as the south pole,* $Q_i^{(\beta)}(y)$ *satisfies* $Q_i^{(\beta)}(\lambda y) = \lambda^\beta Q_i^{(\beta)}(y)$*,* $\forall \lambda > 0,\ y \in \mathbb{R}^n$*, and* $R_i(y)$ *satisfies*

$$\sum_{s=0}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s R_i(y)||y|^{-\beta+s} \to 0$$

uniformly for i *as* $y \to 0$*.*

Suppose also that $Q_i^{(\beta)} \to Q^{(\beta)}$ *in* $C^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ *and for some positive constant* A_6 *that*

$$A_6|y|^{\beta-1} \le |\nabla Q^{(\beta)}(y)|, \quad |y| \le \varepsilon_0, \tag{5.13}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla Q^{(\beta)}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Q^{(\beta)}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \end{pmatrix} \ne 0, \quad \forall\, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{5.14}$$

If P_0 *is an isolated simple blow up point of* v_i*, then* v_i *has to have at least another blow up point.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary, P_0 is the only blow up point of v_i.

We make a stereographic projection with P_0 being the south pole to the equatorial plane of $\mathbb{S}^n$, with its inverse π. Then the Eq. (5.11) is transformed to

$$(-\Delta)^\sigma u_i = c(n,\sigma)K_i(y)u_i^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{5.15}$$

with

$$u_i(y) = \left(\frac{2}{1+|y|^2}\right)^{(n-2\sigma)/2} v_i(\pi(y)).$$

Let $y_i \to 0$ be the local maximum point of u_i. It follows from Lemma 4.7 that

$$|\nabla K_i(y_i)| = O(u_i(y_i)^{-2} + u_i(y_i)^{-2(\beta-1)/(n-2\sigma)}).$$

First we establish

$$|y_i| = O(u_i(y_i)^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}). \tag{5.16}$$

Since we have assumed that v_i has no other blow up point other than P_0, it follows from Proposition 4.4 and Harnack inequality that for $|y| \ge \varepsilon > 0,\ u_i(y) \le C(\varepsilon)|y|^{2\sigma-n}u_i(y_i)^{-1}$.

By Proposition A.1 we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla K_i u_i^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} = 0. \tag{5.17}$$

It follows that for $\varepsilon > 0$ small we have

$$\left| \int_{B_\varepsilon} \nabla K_i(y+y_i)u_i(y+y_i)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \right| \le C(\varepsilon)u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}.$$

Using our hypotheses on $\nabla Q^{(\beta)}$ and R_i we have

$$\left|\int_{B_\varepsilon}(1+o_\varepsilon(1))\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(y+y_i)u_i(y+y_i)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right| \le C(\varepsilon)u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}.$$

Multiplying the above by $m_i^{(2/(n-2\sigma))(\beta-1)}$, where $m_i = u_i(y_i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{B_\varepsilon}(1+o_\varepsilon(1))\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(m_i^{2/(n-2\sigma)}y+\tilde{y}_i)u_i(y+y_i)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right|\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)u_i(y_i)^{(2/(n-2\sigma))(\beta-1-n)}\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{y}_i = m_i^{2/(n-2\sigma)}y_i$. Suppose (5.16) is false, namely, $\tilde{y}_i \to +\infty$ along a subsequence. Then it follows from Proposition 4.1 (we may choose $R_i \le |\tilde{y}_i|/4$) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{|y|\le R_i m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}}(1+o_\varepsilon(1))\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(m_i^{2/(n-2\sigma)}y+\tilde{y}_i)u_i(y+y_i)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right|\\ &=\left|\int_{|z|\le R_i}(1+o_\varepsilon(1))\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(z+\tilde{y}_i)\big(m_i^{-1}u_i(m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}z+y_i)\big)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right| \sim |\tilde{y}_i|^{\beta-1}.\end{aligned}$$

On the hand, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{R_i m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}\le|y|\le\varepsilon}(1+o_\varepsilon(1))\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(m_i^{2/(n-2\sigma)}y+\tilde{y}_i)u_i(y+y_i)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right|\\ &\le C\left|\int_{R_i m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}\le|y|\le\varepsilon}\big(|m_i^{2/(n-2\sigma)}y|^{\beta-1}+|\tilde{y}_i|^{\beta-1}\big)u_i(y+y_i)^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}}\right|\\ &\le o(1)|\tilde{y}_i|^{\beta-1}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|\tilde{y}_i|^{\beta-1} \le C(\varepsilon)m_i^{(2/(n-2\sigma))(\beta-1-n)},$$

which implies that

$$|y_i| \le C(\varepsilon)m_i^{-(2/(n-2\sigma))(n/(\beta-1))} = o(m_i^{-2/(n-2\sigma)}).$$

This contradicts to that $\tilde{y}_i \to \infty$. Thus (5.16) holds.

We are going to find some y_0 such that (5.14) fails.

It follows from Kazdan-Warner condition Proposition A.1 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\langle y, \nabla K_i(y+y_i)\rangle u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-2\sigma)} = 0. \tag{5.18}$$

Since P_0 is an isolated simple blow up point and the only blow up point of v_i, we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\left|\int_{B_\varepsilon}\langle y, \nabla K_i(y+y_i)\rangle u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-\sigma)}\right| \le C(\varepsilon)u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}.$$

It follows from Lemma (4.5) and expression of K_i that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{B_\varepsilon}\langle y,\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(y+y_i)\rangle u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-2\sigma)}\right|\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\\
&\quad+o_\varepsilon(1)\int_{B_\varepsilon}|y||y+y_i|^{\beta-1}u_i(y+y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\\
&\quad+o_\varepsilon(1)\int_{B_\varepsilon}(|y|^\beta+|y||y_i|^{\beta-1})u_i(y+y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)u_i(y_i)^{-2n/(n-2\sigma)}+o_\varepsilon(1)u_i(y_i)^{-2\beta/(n-2\sigma)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.16) in the last inequality.

Multiplying the above by $u_i(y_i)^{2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}$, due to $\beta<n$ we obtain

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}u_i(y_i)^{2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}\left|\int_{B_\varepsilon}\langle y,\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(y+y_i)\rangle u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-2\sigma)}\right|=o_\varepsilon(1). \tag{5.19}$$

Let $R_i\to\infty$ as $i\to\infty$. We assume that $r_i:=R_iu_i(y_i)^{-\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}\to 0$ as we did in Proposition 4.1. By Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_i(y_i)^{2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}\left|\int_{r_i\le|y|\le\varepsilon}\langle y,\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(y+y_i)\rangle u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-2\sigma)}\right|\\
&\le\lim_{i\to\infty}u_i(y_i)^{2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}\left|\int_{r_i\le|y|\le\varepsilon}(|y|^\beta+|y||y_i|^{\beta-1})u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-2\sigma)}\right|\to 0
\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

as $i\to\infty$. Combining (5.19) and (5.20), we conclude that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}u_i(y_i)^{2\beta/(n-2\sigma)}\left|\int_{B_{r_i}}\langle y,\nabla Q_i^{(\beta)}(y+y_i)\rangle u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-2\sigma)}\right|=o_\varepsilon(1).$$

It follows from changing variable $z=u_i(y_i)^{\frac{2}{n-2\sigma}}y$, applying Proposition 4.1 and then letting $\varepsilon\to 0$ that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\langle z,\nabla Q^{(\beta)}(z+z_0)\rangle(1+k|z|^2)^{-n}=0, \tag{5.21}$$

where $z_0=\lim_{i\to\infty}u_i(y_i)^{2/(n-2\sigma)}y_i$ and $k=\lim_{i\to\infty}K_i(y_i)^{1/\sigma}$.

On the other hand, from (5.17)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\nabla K_i(y+y_i)u_i(y+y_i)^{2n/(n-2\sigma)}=0. \tag{5.22}$$

Arguing as above, we will have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\nabla Q^{(\beta)}(z+z_0)(1+k|z|^2)^{-n}=0. \tag{5.23}$$

It follows from (5.21) and (5.23) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} & Q^{(\beta)}(z+z_0)(1+k|z|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \beta^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\langle z+z_0, \nabla Q^{(\beta)}(z+z_0)\rangle(1+k|z|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}z \\ &= 0.\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Therefore, (5.14) does not hold for $y_0 = \sqrt{k}z_0$. ☐

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\sigma \in (0,1)$ and $n \geq 3$. Suppose that $K \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{S}^n)$, for some constant $A_1 > 0$,*

$$1/A_1 \leq K_i(\xi) \leq A_1 \quad \textit{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

Suppose also that for any critical point ξ_0 of K, under the stereographic projection coordinate system $\{y_1, \cdots, y_n\}$ with ξ_0 as south pole, there exist some small neighborhood $\mathscr{O}$ of 0, a positive constant L, and $\beta = \beta(\xi_0) \in (n-2\sigma, n)$ such that

$$\|\nabla^{[\beta]}K\|_{C^{\beta-[\beta]}(\mathscr{O})} \leq L$$

and

$$K(y) = K(0) + Q^{(\beta)}_{(\xi_0)}(y) + R_{(\xi_0)}(y) \quad \textit{in } \mathscr{O},$$

where $Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(y) \in C^{[\beta]-1,1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ satisfies $Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(\lambda y) = \lambda^\beta Q^{(\beta)}_{\xi_0}(y)$, $\forall \lambda > 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and for some positive constant A_6

$$A_6|y|^{\beta-1} \leq |\nabla Q^{(\beta)}(y)|, \quad y \in \mathscr{O},$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla Q^{(\beta)}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} Q^{(\beta)}(y+y_0)(1+|y|^2)^{-n}\,\mathrm{d}y \end{pmatrix} \neq 0, \quad \forall\, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and $R_{\xi_0}(y) \in C^{[\beta]-1,1}(\mathscr{O})$ satisfies $\lim_{y\to 0}\sum_{s=0}^{[\beta]} |\nabla^s R|\xi_0(y)|y|^{-\beta+s} = 0$.

Then there exists a positive constant $C \geq 1$ depending on n, σ, K such that for any solution v of (1.5)

$$1/C \leq v \leq C, \quad \textit{on } \mathbb{S}^n.$$

Proof. It follows directly from Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 5.3. ☐

Proof of the compactness part of Theorem 1.2. It is easy to check that, if K satisfies the condition in Theorem 1.2, then it must satisfy the condition in the above theorem. Therefore, we have the lower and upper bounds of v. The C^2 norm bound of v follows immediately. ☐

A Appendix

A.1 A Kazdan-Warner identity

In this section we are going to show (1.7), which is a consequence of the following

Proposition A.1. *Let $K > 0$ be a C^1 function on S^n, and let v be a positive function in $C^2(S^n)$ satisfying*

$$P_\sigma(v) = K v^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{n-2\sigma}}, \quad \text{on } S^n. \tag{A.1}$$

Then, for any conformal Killing vector field X on S^n, we have

$$\int_{S^n} (\nabla_X K) v^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}V_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} = 0. \tag{A.2}$$

Let $\varphi_t : S^n \to S^n$ be a one parameter family of conformal diffeomorphism (in this case they are Möbius transformations), depending on t smoothly, $|t| < 1$, and $\varphi_0 = identity$. Then

$$X := \frac{d}{dt}(\varphi_t)^{-1}\Big|_{t=0} \quad \text{is a conformal Killing vector field on } S^n. \tag{A.3}$$

Proof. The proof is standard (see, e.g., [12] for a Kazdan-Warner identity for prescribed scalar curvature problems) and we include it here for completeness. Since P_σ is a self-adjoint operator, (A.1) has a variational formulation:

$$I[v] := \frac{1}{2}\int_{S^n} v P_\sigma(v) \, \mathrm{d}V_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} - \frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{S^n} K v^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}V_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}.$$

Let X be a conformal Killing vector field, then there exists $\{\varphi_t\}$ satisfying (A.3). Let

$$v_t := (v \circ \varphi_t) w_t$$

where w_t is given by

$$g_t := \varphi_t^* g_{\mathbb{S}^n} = w_t^{\frac{4}{n-2\sigma}} g_{\mathbb{S}^n}.$$

Then

$$I[v_t] = \frac{1}{2}\int_{S^n} v P_\sigma(v) \, \mathrm{d}V_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}} - \frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{S^n} K(\varphi_t^{-1}(x)) v^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}V_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}.$$

It follows from (A.1) that

$$0 = I'[v]\left(\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} v_t\right) = \frac{d}{dt} I[v_t]\Big|_{t=0} = -\frac{n-2\sigma}{2n}\int_{S^n} (\nabla_X K) v^{\frac{2n}{n-2\sigma}} \, \mathrm{d}V_{g_{\mathbb{S}^n}}.$$

□

A.2 A proof of Lemma 4.4

The classical Bôcher theorem in harmonic function theory states that a positive harmonic function u in a punctured ball $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ must be of the form

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} -a \log |x| + h(x), & n = 2, \\ a|x|^{2-n} + h(x), & n \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

where a is a nonnegative constant and h is a harmonic function in B_1.

We are going to establish a similar result, Lemma 4.4, in our setting. Denote $\mathcal{B}_R^+ = \{X : |X| < R, t > 0\}$, $\partial'\mathcal{B}_R^+ = \{(x,t) : |x| < R\}$ and $\partial''\mathcal{B} = \partial\mathcal{B}_R^+ \setminus \partial'\mathcal{B}_R^+$.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. We adapt the proof of the Bôcher theorem given in [5].

Define

$$A[U](r)=\frac{\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+}t^{1-2\sigma}U(x,t)dS_r}{\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+}t^{1-2\sigma}dS_r}$$

where $r=|(x,t)|>0$ and dS_r is the volume element of $\partial''\mathcal{B}_r$.

By direct computation we have

$$\frac{d}{dr}A[U](r)=\frac{\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+}t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U(x,t)\cdot\frac{(x,t)}{r}dS_r}{\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+}t^{1-2\sigma}dS_r}.$$

Let

$$f(r)=\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+}t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U(x,t)\cdot\frac{(x,t)}{r}dS_r.$$

Since U satisfies (4.18), by integration by parts we have

$$f(r_1)=f(r_2),\ \forall\, 0<r_1,r_2<1.$$

Notice that

$$\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_r^+}t^{1-2\sigma}dS_r=r^{n+1-2\sigma}\int_{\partial''\mathcal{B}_1^+}t^{1-2\sigma}dS_1.$$

Thus there exists a constant b such that

$$\frac{d}{dr}A[U](r)=br^{-n-1+2\sigma}.$$

So there exist constants a and b such that

$$A[U](r)=a+br^{2\sigma-n}.$$

Since we have the Harnack inequalities for U as in the proof of Lemma 4.1, the rest of the arguments are rather similar to those in [5] and are omitted here. We refer to [5] for details. ☐

A.3 Two lemmas on maximum principles

Lemma A.1. *Let* $Q_1=B_1\times(0,1)\subset\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$*, then there exists* $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(n,\sigma)$ *such that for all* $|a(x)|\le\varepsilon|x|^{-2\sigma}$*, if* $U\in H(t^{1-2\sigma},Q_1)$*,* $U\ge0$ *on* $\partial''Q_1$*, and*

$$\int_{Q_1}t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U\nabla\varphi\ge\int_{B_1}aU(\cdot,0)\varphi\quad\textit{for all }0\le\varphi\in C_c^\infty(Q_1).$$

Then

$$U\ge0\quad\textit{in }Q_1.$$

Proof. By a density argument, we can use U^- as a test function. Hence we have

$$\int_{Q_1}t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U^-|^2\le\int_{B_1}|a|(U^-(\cdot,0))^2.\tag{A.4}$$

We extend U^- to be zero outside of Q_1 and still denote it as U^-. Then the trace

$$U^-(\cdot,0) \in \dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Since

$$\|U^-(\cdot,0)\|^2_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla \mathcal{P}_\sigma * U^-(\cdot,0)|^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U^-|^2,$$

we have

$$\|U^-(\cdot,0)\|^2_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le \int_{B_1} |a|(U^-(\cdot,0))^2.$$

By Hardy's inequality (see, e.g., [94])

$$C(n,\sigma)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^{-2\sigma}(U^-(\cdot,0))^2 \le \|U^-(\cdot,0)\|^2_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

where $C(n,\sigma) = 2^{2\sigma}\frac{\Gamma((n+2\sigma)/4)}{\Gamma((n-2\sigma)/4)}$ is the best constant. Hence if $\varepsilon < C(n,\sigma)$, $U^-(\cdot,0) \equiv 0$ and hence by (A.4), $U^- \equiv 0$ in Q_1. ☐

Lemma A.2. *Let* $a(x) \in L^\infty(B_1)$. *Let* $W \in C(\overline{Q_1}) \cap C^2(Q_1)$ *satisfying* $\nabla_x W \in C(\overline{Q_1})$, $t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t W \in C(\overline{Q_1})$, *and*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla W) & \ge 0 \quad \textit{in } Q_1 \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t W(x,t) & \ge a(x)W(x,0) \quad \textit{on } \partial' Q_1 \\ \qquad\qquad W & > 0 \quad \textit{in } \overline{Q_1}. \end{cases} \tag{A.5}$$

If $U \in C(\overline{Q_1}) \cap C^2(Q_1)$ *satisfying* $\nabla_x U \in C(\overline{Q_1})$, $t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U \in C(\overline{Q_1})$, *and*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U) & \ge 0 \quad \textit{in } Q_1 \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t U(x,t) & \ge a(x)U(x,0) \quad \textit{on } \partial' Q_1 \\ \qquad\qquad U & \ge 0 \quad \textit{in } \partial'' Q_1. \end{cases} \tag{A.6}$$

Then $U \ge 0$ *in* Q_1.

Proof. Let $V = U/W$. Then

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla V) - 2t^{1-2\sigma}\frac{\nabla V \nabla W}{W} - \frac{\mathrm{div}(t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla W)V}{W} & \ge 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1 \\ -\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t V + \frac{V}{W}\big(-\lim\limits_{t\to 0} t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t W(x,t) - a(x)W(x,0)\big) & \ge 0 \quad \text{on } \partial' Q_1 \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad V & \ge 0 \quad \text{in } \partial'' Q_1. \end{cases} \tag{A.7}$$

We are going to show that $V \ge 0$ in Q_1. If not, then we choose k such that $\inf_{Q_1} v < k \le 0$. Let

$$V_k = V - k \quad \text{and } V_k^- = \max(-V_k, 0).$$

Multiplying V_k^- to (A.7), we have

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \le 2\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}W^{-1}V_k^-\nabla V_k^-\nabla W. \tag{A.8}$$

Case 1: Suppose $1-2\sigma \le 0$. Denote $\Gamma_k = Supp(\nabla V_k^-)$. Then by the Hölder inequality and the bounds of $\nabla_x W$, $t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t W$,

$$2\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} W^{-1} V_k^- \nabla V_k^- \nabla W \le C\left(\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\Gamma_k} t^{1-2\sigma}|V_k^-|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence it follows from (A.8) that

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \le C\int_{\Gamma_k} t^{1-2\sigma}|V_k^-|^2. \tag{A.9}$$

Since $V_k^- = 0$ on $\partial'' Q_1$, by Lemma 2.1 in [90],

$$\left(\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|V_k^-|^{2(n+1)/n}\right)^{\frac{n}{n+1}} \le C\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2. \tag{A.10}$$

By (A.9), (A.10) and Hölder inequality,

$$\int_{\Gamma_k} t^{1-2\sigma} \ge C.$$

This yields a contradiction when $k \to \inf_{Q_1} v$, since $\nabla V = 0$ on the set of $V \equiv \inf_{Q_1} V$.

Case 2: Suppose $1-2\sigma > 0$. Denote $\Gamma_k = Supp(V_k^-)$. Then by Hölder inequality and the bounds of $\nabla_x W$, $t^{1-2\sigma}\partial_t W$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 &\le 2\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma} W^{-1} V_k^- \nabla V_k^- \nabla W\\ &\le C\int_{Q_1} V_k^- \nabla V_k^-\\ &\le C\Big(\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_{Q_1} t^{2\sigma-1}|V_k^-|^2\Big)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \le C\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \int_{Q_1} t^{2\sigma-1}|V_k^-|^2.$$

Since $V_k^- = 0$ on $\partial'' Q_1$, by the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [90], for any $\beta > -1$,

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{\beta}|V_k^-|^2 \le C(\beta)\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2.$$

In the following we choose $\beta = \sigma - 1$. Hence,

$$\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \int_{Q_1} t^{\sigma-1}|V_k^-|^2 \le C\int_{Q_1} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \int_{Q_1} t^{2\sigma-1}|V_k^-|^2,$$

i.e.

$$\int_{\Gamma_k} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \int_{\Gamma_k} t^{\sigma-1}|V_k^-|^2 \le C\int_{\Gamma_k} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V_k^-|^2 \int_{\Gamma_k} t^{2\sigma-1}|V_k^-|^2.$$

Fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small which will be chosen later. By the strong maximum principle $\inf_{Q_1} V$ has to be attained only on $\partial' Q_1$, then we can choose k sufficiently closed to $\inf_{Q_1} V$ such that $\Gamma_k \subset B_1 \times [0, \varepsilon]$. Then

$$\varepsilon^{-\sigma} \int_{\Gamma_k} t^{2\sigma-1} |V_k^-|^2 \leq C \int_{\Gamma_k} t^{\sigma-1} |V_k^-|^2.$$

Choose ε small enough such that $\varepsilon^{-\sigma} > C + 1$. It follows that

$$\int_{\Gamma_k} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla V_k^-|^2 \int_{\Gamma_k} t^{2\sigma-1} |V_k^-|^2 = 0.$$

Hence one of them has to be zero, which reaches a contradiction immediately. $\square$

A.4 Complementarities

Lemma A.3. *Let $u(x) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $V(\cdot, t) = \mathcal{P}_\sigma(\cdot, t) * u(\cdot)$. For any $U \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \cup \partial \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1})$ with $U(x, 0) = u(x)$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla V|^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma} |\nabla U|^2.$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq \eta(x,t) \leq 1$, $Supp(\eta) \subset \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+$, $\eta = 1$ in $\mathcal{B}_R^+$ and $|\nabla \eta| \leq 2/R$. In the end we will let $R \to \infty$ and hence we may assume that U is supported in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{R/2}^+}$. Since $\operatorname{div}(t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla V) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma} \nabla V \nabla (\eta (U - V)) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma} \eta \nabla U \nabla V - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma} \eta |\nabla V|^2 - \int_{\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_R^+} t^{1-2\sigma} V \nabla \eta \nabla V \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\eta(U - V) = 0$ on the boundary of $\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+$ in the first equality.

Note that for $(x,t) \in \mathcal{B}_{2R}^+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_R^+$

$$\begin{aligned} |V(x,t)| &= \beta(n,\sigma) \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{t^{2\sigma}}{(|x - \xi|^2 + t^2)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}}} u(\xi) \, d\xi \right| \\ &\leq \beta(n,\sigma) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{(|x|^2 + t^2)^\sigma}{(|x|^2/4 + t^2)^{\frac{n+2\sigma}{2}}} |u(\xi)| \, d\xi \\ &\leq C(n,\sigma) (|x|^2 + t^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|u\|_{L^1} \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we have used that U is supported in $\overline{\mathcal{B}_{R/2}^+}$.

Direct computations yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+\setminus\mathcal{B}_R^+} t^{1-2\sigma} V\nabla\eta\nabla V\right| \\
&\le \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+\setminus\mathcal{B}_R^+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_{\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+\setminus\mathcal{B}_R^+} t^{1-2\sigma}V^2|\nabla\eta|^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\le \left(\int_{\mathcal{B}_{2R}^+\setminus\mathcal{B}_R^+} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V|^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \cdot C(n,\sigma)|u|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}(R^{n+2-2\sigma-2-2n})^{1/2} \to 0 \text{ as } R\to\infty
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.4) that $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V|^2<\infty$. Therefore, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V|^2 \le \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma}\nabla U\nabla V\right|.$$

Finally, by Hölder inequality,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla V|^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} t^{1-2\sigma}|\nabla U|^2.$$

□

References

[1] Aubin, T.; Bahri, A: *Méthodes de topologie algébrique pour le problme̒ de la courbure scalaire prescrite*. (French) [Methods of algebraic topology for the problem of prescribed scalar curvature], J. Math. Pures Appl. **76** (1997), 525–549.

[2] Aubin, T.; Bahri, A: *Une hypothèse topologique pour le problème de la courbure scalaire prescrite*. (French) [A topological hypothesis for the problem of prescribed scalar curvature] J. Math. Pures Appl. **76** (1997), 843–850.

[3] Aubin, T.; Hebey, E: *Courbure scalaire prescrite*, Bull. Sci. Math. **115** (1991), 125–131.

[4] Aubin, T.; Li, Y.Y.: *On the best Sobolev inequality,* J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **78** (1999), no. 4, 353–387.

[5] Axler, S.; Bourdon, P.; Ramey, W.: *Bôcher's Theorem,* Amer. Math. Month. **99** (1992), 51–55.

[6] Bahri, A.; Coron, J.-M.: *The calar curvature problem on the standard three-dimensional sphere,* J. Funct. Anal. **255** (1991), 106–172.

[7] Bahri, A.; Li, Y.Y.; Rey, O.: *On a variational problem with lack of compactness: the topological effect of the critical points at infinity*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **3** (1995), no. 1, 67–93.

[8] Beckner, W.: *Sharp Sobolev inequalities on the sphere and the Moser-Trudinger inequality,* Ann. of Math. (2) **138** (1993), 213–242.

[9] Bahoura, S.S.: *Harnack inequalities for Yamabe type equations*, Bull. Sci. Math. **133** (2009), 875–892.

[10] Ben Ayed, M.; Ould Ahmedou, M.O.: *On the prescribed scalar curvature on 3-half spheres: multiplicity results and Morse inequalities at infinity*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **23** (2009), 655–683.

[11] Berestycki, H.; Nirenberg, L.: *On the method of moving planes and the sliding method*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. **22** (1991), 1–37.

[12] Bourguignon, J.P.; Ezin, J.P.: *Scalar curvature functions in a conformal class of metrics and conformal transformations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **301** (1987), no. 2, 723–736.

[13] Branson, T.P.: *Sharp inequalities, the functional determinant, and the complementary series*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **347** (1995), 367–3742.

[14] Brendle, S.: *Prescribing a higher order conformal invariant on $\mathbb{S}^n$*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003), 837–858.

[15] Brezis, H.; Kato, T.: *Remarks on the Schrödinger operator with singular complex potentials*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **58** (1979), no. 2, 137–151.

[16] Brezis, H.; Nirenberg, L.; *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36** (1983), 437–477.

[17] Byeon, J. *Effect of symmetry to the structure of positive solutions in nonlinear elliptic problems. III,* Asymptot. Anal. **30** (2002), 249–272.

[18] Caffarelli, L.A.: *Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations,* Ann. of Math. (2) **130** (1989), 189–213.

[19] Caffarelli, L.; Silvestre, L.: *The Evans-Krylov theorem for non local fully non linear equations,* Ann. of Math. (2) **174** (2011), no. 2, 1163–1187.

[20] ——: *Regularity results for nonlocal equations by approximation,* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **200** (2011), no. 1, 59–88.

[21] ——: *Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62** (2009), 597–638.

[22] ——: *An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian,* Comm. Partial. Diff. Equ. **32** (2007), 1245–1260.

[23] Cabre, X.; Sire Y.: *Nonlinear equations for fractional Laplacians I: Regularity, maximum principles, and Hamiltonian estimates* preprint, `arXiv:1012.0867`.

[24] Cao, D.; Li, Y.Y..: *Results on positive solutions of elliptic equations with a critical Hardy-Sobolev operator* Methods Appl. Anal. **15** (2008), no. 1, 81–95.

[25] Cao, D.; Noussair, E.S.; Yan. S.: *On the scalar curvature equation $-\Delta u = (1+\epsilon K)u^{(N+2)/(N-2)}$ in R^N*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **15** (2002), 403–419.

[26] Catrina, F.; Wang, Z.-Q.: *Symmetric solutions for the prescribed scalar curvature problem*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **49** (2000), 779–813.

[27] Chang, K.; Liu, J.: *On Nirenberg's problem,* Internat. J. Math. **4** (1993), no. 1, 35–58.

[28] Chang, S.-Y.; González, M.: *Fractional Laplacian in conformal geometry,* Adv. Math. **226** (2011), no. 2, 1410–1432.

[29] Chang, S.-Y. ; Gursky, M.J. ;Yang, P.: *The scalar curvature equation on 2- and 3-spheres*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **1** (1993), 205–229.

[30] Chang, S.-Y.; Yang, P.: *Prescribing Gaussian curvature on $\mathbb{S}^2$*, Acta Math. **159** (1987), 215–259.

[31] ——: *Conformal deformation of metrics on $\mathbb{S}^2$,* J. Differential Geom. **27** (1988), 259–296.

[32] ——: *A perturbation result in prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^n$,* Duke Math. J. **64** (1991), no. 1, 27–69.

[33] Chen, C.C. ; Lin, C.S. : *Estimate of the conformal scalar curvature equation via the method of moving planes. II*, J. Differential Geom. **49** (1998), 115–178.

[34] Chen, W.; Ding, W.: *Scalar curvatures on S^2*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **303** (1987), 365–382.

[35] Chen, W.; Li, C.: *A priori estimates for prescribing scalar curvature equations,* Ann. of Math. **145** (1997), 547–564.

[36] Chen, W.; Li, C.; Ou, B.: *Classification of solutions for an integral equation,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **59** (2006), 330–343.

[37] Chen, X.; Xu, X.: *The scalar curvature flow on S^n — perturbation theorem revisited,* Invent. Math., to appear.

[38] Cherrier, P.: *Problèmes de Neumann non linéaires sur les variétés riemanniennes*, J. Funct. Anal. **57** (1984), no. 2, 154–206.

[39] Chua, S.: *Extension Theorems on Weighted Sobolev Spaces,* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **41** (1992), 1027–1076.

[40] de Pablo, A., Sánchez, U.: *Some Liouville-type results for a fractional equation,* preprint.

[41] Djadli, Z.; Malchiodi, A.: *Existence of conformal metrics with constant Q-curvature*, Ann. of Math. (2) **168** (2008), no. 3, 813–858.

[42] Djadli, Z.; Malchiodi, A.; Ahmedou, M.O.: *Prescribing a fourth order conformal invariant on the standard sphere. I. A perturbation result*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **4** (2002), 375–408.

[43] ——: *Prescribing a fourth order conformal invariant on the standard sphere. II. Blow up analysis and applications,* Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. **5** (2002), 387–434.

[44] Druet, O.: *Elliptic equations with critical Sobolev exponents in dimension 3*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **19** (2002), 125–142.

[45] Escobar, J.F.; Garcia, G.: *Conformal metrics on the ball with zero scalar curvature and prescribed mean curvature on the boundary*, J. Funct. Anal. **211** (2004), 71–152.

[46] Escobar, J.F.; Schoen, R.: *Conformal metrics with prescribed scalar curvature,* Invent. Math. **86** (1986), 243–254.

[47] Esposito, P.; Mancini, G.: *A prescribed scalar curvature-type equation: almost critical manifolds and multiple solutions,* J. Funct. Anal. **205** (2003), no. 2, 306–356.

[48] Fabes, E.; Kenig, C.; Serapioni, R.: *The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations **7** (1982), 77–116.

[49] Fefferman, C.; Graham, C. R.: *Conformal invariants*, The mathematical heritage of Élie Cartan (Lyon, 1984). Astérisque 1985, Numero Hors Serie, 95116.

[50] Felli, V.: *Existence of conformal metrics on* $\mathbb{S}^n$ *with prescribed fourth-order invariant,* Adv. Differential Equations **7** (2002), 47–76.

[51] González, M.; Mazzeo, R.; Sire, Y.: *Singular solutions of fractional order conformal Laplacians,* J. Geom. Anal. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-011-9217-9.

[52] González, M.; Qing, J.: *Fractional conformal Laplacians and fractional Yamabe problems*, preprint `arXiv:1012.0579`.

[53] Graham, C.R.; Zworski, M.: *Scattering matrix in conformal geometry,* Invent. Math. **152** (2003), 89–118.

[54] Graham, C.R.; Jenne, R.; Mason, L.J.; Sparling, G.A.J.: *Conformally invariant powers of the Laplacian I. Existence,* J. London Math. Soc. **46** (1992), 557–565.

[55] Han, Z.-C. : *Prescribing Gaussian curvature on* S^2, Duke Math. J. **61** (1990), 679–703.

[56] Han, Z.-C.; Li, Y.Y. : *A note on the Kazdan-Warner type condition,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **13** (1996), 283–292.

[57] ——: *The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary: existence and compactness results,* Duke Math. J. **99** (1999), 489–542.

[58] ——: *On the local solvability of the Nirenberg problem on* S^2, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **28** (2010), 607–615.

[59] Hu, B.: *Nonexistence of a positive solution of the Laplace equation with a nonlinear boundary condition,* Differential Integral Equations **7** (1994), no. 2, 301–313.

[60] Hu, B.; Yin, H.-M.: *The profile near blowup time for solution of the heat equation with a nonlinear boundary condition*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **346** (1994), no. 1, 117–135.

[61] Ji, M. : *Scalar curvature equation on* S^n*. I. Topological conditions,* J. Differential Equations **246** (2009), 749–787.

[62] ——: *Scalar curvature equation on* S^n*. II. Analytic characterizations,* J. Differential Equations **246** (2009), 788–818.

[63] Jin, T.; Li, Y.Y.; Xiong, J.: *On a fractional Nirenberg problem, part II: existence of solutions,* in preparation, 2011.

[64] Jin, T.; Xiong, J.: *A fractional Yamabe flow and some applications,* preprint, 2011.

[65] Koutroufiotis, D.: *Gaussian curvature and conformal mapping,* J. Differential Geom. **7** (1972), 479–488.

[66] Kassmann, M.: *The classical Harnack inequality fails for nonlocal operators,* submitted, available as SFB 611-preprint No. 360.

[67] Li, Y.Y. : *Prescribing scalar curvature on* S^3, S^4 *and related problems,* J. Funct. Anal. **118** (1993),

43–118.

[68] ——: *Prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^n$ and related problems. I.*, J. Differential Equations **120** (1995), 319–410.

[69] ——: *Prescribing scalar curvature on $\mathbb{S}^n$ and related problems. II. Existence and compactness.*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **49** (1996), 541–597.

[70] ——: *Remark on some conformally invariant integral equations: the method of moving spheres*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **6** (2004), 153–180.

[71] Li, Y.Y.; Nirenberg, L.: *Estimates for elliptic system from composition material*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **56** (2003), 892–925.

[72] Li,Y.Y.; Zhang, L.: *Liouville-type theorems and Harnack-type inequalities for semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Anal. Math. **90** (2003), 27–87.

[73] Li,Y.Y.; Zhu, M.: *Uniqueness theorems through the method of moving spheres*, Duke Math. J. **80**(1995), 383–418.

[74] Lieb, E.H.: *Sharp constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and related inequalities*, Ann. of Math. (2) **118** (1983), 349–374.

[75] Lin, L.; Liu, Z.: *Multi-bump solutions and multi-tower solutions for equations on R^N*, J. Funct. Anal. 257 (2009), 485–505.

[76] Lions, J.-L.; Magenes, E.: Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications. Vol. I. Translated from the French by P. Kenneth. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 181. *Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg*, 1972.

[77] Malchiodi, A.: *The scalar curvature problem on S^n: an approach via Morse theory*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **14** (2002), 429-445.

[78] Moser, J.: *On a nonlinear problem in differential geometry*, Dynamical Systems (M. Peixoto, Editor), Academic Press, New York 1973.

[79] Morpurgo, C.: *Sharp inequalities for functional integrals and traces of conformally invariant*, Duke Math. J. **114** (2002), 477–553.

[80] Ou, B.: *Positive harmonic functions on the upper half space satisfying a nonlinear boundary condition*, Differential Integral Equations **9** (1996), no. 5, 1157–1164.

[81] Pavlov, P.; Samko, S.: *A description of spaces $L_p^\alpha(S_{n-1})$ in terms of spherical hypersingular integrals* (Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **276** (1984), no. 3, 546–550. English translation: Soviet Math. Dokl. **29** (1984), no. 3, 549–553.

[82] Qing, J.; Raske, D.: *On positive solutions to semilinear conformally invariant equations on locally conformally flat manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2006, Art. ID 94172, 20 pp.

[83] Schneider, M.: *Prescribing scalar curvature on S^3*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **24** (2007), 563–587.

[84] ——: *The scalar curvature equation on S^3*, J. Funct. Anal. 257 (2009), 2840–2863.

[85] Silvestre, L.: *Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **60** (2007), no. 1, 67–112.

[86] Stein, E.: Singular integrals and differentiability properties of function, Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30 *Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.* 1970 xiv+290 pp.

[87] Schoen, R.: *On the number of constant scalar curvature metrics in a conformal class*, in "Differential Geometry: A Symposium in Honor of Manfredo Do Carmo" (H. B. Lawson and K. Tenenblat, Eds), 311–320, Wiley, New York, 1991.

[88] Schoen, R.; Zhang, D.: *Prescribed scalar curvature on the n-sphere*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4** (1996), 1–25.

[89] Trudinger, N.: *Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3) **22** (1968), 265–274.

[90] Tan, J.; Xiong, J.: *A Harnack inequality for fractional Laplace equations with lower order terms*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **31** (2011), no. 3, 975–983.

[91] Wei, J.; Xu, X. *Prescribing Q-curvature problem on $\mathbb{S}^n$*, J. Funct. Anal. **257** (2009), 1995–2023.

[92] ——: *On conformal deformations of metrics on* $\mathbb{S}^n$, J. Funct. Anal. **157** (1998), 292–325.

[93] Wei, J.; Yan, S.: *Infinitely many solutions for the prescribed scalar curvature problem on* $\mathbb{S}^n$, J. Funct. Anal. **258** (2010), 3048–3081.

[94] Yafaev, D: *Sharp constants in the Hardy-Rellich inequalities*, J. Funct. Anal. **168** (1999), no. 1, 121–144.

[95] Zhang, L.: *Harnack type inequalities for conformal scalar curvature equation*, Math. Ann. **339** (2007), 195–220.

[96] Zhu, M.: *Liouville theorems on some indefinite equations*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **129** (1999), 649–661.

Tianling Jin
Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University
110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA
Email: kingbull@math.rutgers.edu

YanYan Li
Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University
110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA
Email: yyli@math.rutgers.edu

Jingang Xiong
School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University
Beijing 100875, China

and

Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University
110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA
Email: jxiong@mail.bnu.edu.cn/jxiong@math.rutgers.edu